

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD:

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. H. Danby. Prof. M. Ginsberg.
Prof. C. Singer. Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. Rabbi I. I. Mattuck, D.H.L. C. Rabin, D.Phil.

EDITOR:

J. L. TEICHER, M.A., Ph.D.

Vol. III. No. 2

1952

CONTENTS

	Page
D. WINTON THOMAS	
מלח IN JEREMIAH IV. 5: A MILITARY TERM	47
J. L. TEICHER	
JESUS IN THE HABAKKUK SCROLL	53
CECIL ROTH	
NEW NOTES ON PRE-EXPULSION ANGLO-JEWISH SCHOLARS	56
M. WAYSBLUM	
ISAAC OF TROKI AND CHRISTIAN CONTROVERSY IN THE XVI CENTURY	62
JOSEPH REIDER	
MISCELLANEA HEBRAICA	78
J. L. TEICHER	
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	87
RAPHAEL LOEWE and D. WINTON THOMAS	
CURRENT LITERATURE	89

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

CONTENTS

מלאו IN JEREMIAH IV. 5 :

A MILITARY TERM¹

The book of Jeremiah contains, we believe, some Hebrew military terms which have not so far been appreciated as such. One such term is מלאו in ch. iv, 5. The evidence we have to consider, if we wish to discover the true meaning of מלאו in this passage, is fourfold: the Old Testament itself, the ancient versions (more especially the LXX and Syriac versions), the evidence of comparative Semitic philology, and the writings of Jewish commentators. From a consideration of these four different types of evidence the correct interpretation of מלאו, which has been generally missed by lexicographers and commentators, will, it is hoped, become clear.

The Hebrew text of Jer. iv, 5 runs as follows:

הנידו ביהודה ובירושלם השמיעו ואמרו ותקעו שופר בארץ קראו מלאו
ואמרו האספו ונבואה אל-ערי המבצר

In the Revised Version the verse is translated thus:

"Declare ye in Judah, and publish in Jerusalem; and say, Blow ye the trumpet in the land: cry aloud and say, Assemble yourselves, and let us go into the fenced cities."

In this translation the word "cry" represents, of course, קראו, and the word "aloud" represents מלאו. The Revisers saw in the phrase קראו מלאו an asyndetous construction. For them the two words meant "cry, fill," the implied object of מלאו being קול "voice." So the phrase was taken to mean "cry, fill" (the voice), i.e., "cry with full voice," "cry aloud." This is indeed the way in which the phrase is translated in the LXX (*kekraxate mega*), the Peshitta (*qerau beqala rama*) and the Vulgate (*clamate fortiter*), and the way too in which it is most commonly explained by grammarians,² lexicographers,³ and commentators.⁴ At least one commentator, however, finds the explanation of an asyndetous construction unsatisfactory, viz., Volz,⁵ who thinks that the original text here read, not קראו מלאו, but קראו מלחמה "proclaim war."

¹ This paper was read at a meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study held in Rome on April 13, 1952.

² So Geseenius, *Hebr. Gramm.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed., p. 387, *et al.*

³ So Geseenius-Buhl (16th ed.), p. 424; Zorell, p. 437; Koehler and Baumgartner, p. 524.

⁴ So F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 23; B. Duham, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 48; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, p. 26.

⁵ *Studien zum Text des Jeremia*, p. 26.

a phrase which does not, however, occur elsewhere in the O.T. No difficulty need be felt, however, about the supposition of an asyndetous construction here, and in the explanation of מלאו which will be suggested in a moment this construction is retained.

What, then, is the true meaning of מלאו? We may make the starting point of our investigation the explanation offered in 1895 by F. Perles¹ of the phrase מלאו השלמים in Jer. li, 11. Perles points out that the Peshitta here renders the verb מלא by *kannesh* "collect, assemble." To this he might have added that this same version renders מלא in 2 Sam. xxiii, 7 similarly by *kannesh*. Qimhi also, Perles points out, explains מלא here as meaning "collect, gather together"—his words are אספו אותם והכניסם למלחמה "gather them together and prepare them for war." The A.V. too has "gather the shields." This meaning "collect, gather together" Perles believes to be correct in Jer. li, 11, and in his remarks he includes a reference to Jer. iv, 5 and Job xvi, 10. His reference to these two passages is incidental only, and he does not elaborate upon it. In what follows an attempt is made to carry further the brief hint given by him as to the meaning of מלאו in Jer. iv, 5.

Let us look first at Job xvi, 10, one of the passages to which Perles refers. Here Job's adversaries are deriding him. The Hebrew text runs:

פִּעְרוּ עָלַי בְּפִיהֶם בַּחֲרָפָה הֵכוּ לִחְיִי יַחַד עָלַי יִתְמַלְאוּן :

The translation of the R.V. is as follows:

"They have gaped upon me with their mouth;
They have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully;
They gather themselves together against me."

It is, of course, with the concluding words of the verse that we are now concerned—"they gather themselves together against me." That the Hithp. of מלא here means "mass themselves" is generally recognised by modern lexicographers² and commentators.³ The LXX render יתמלאון by *katedramon* "they have run" (upon me), and the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary by *rehet*.⁴ Rashi says the meaning of it is יתאספון "they gather themselves together," and Levi ben Gershon gives it the same meaning (יתקבצון).⁵ It may well be that the Hithp. of מלא in this sense is a denominative from מלוא, which in the phrase מלא־הנזים (Gen. xlviii, 19) means "a multitude of nations," and in the phrase מלא רעים (Is. xxxi, 4) means

¹ *Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T.*, p. 80f.

² BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 570; GESENIUS-BUHL, p. 424; ZORELL, p. 437; KOEHLER and BAUMGARTNER, p. 525.

³ K. BUDDE, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 85; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 88; P. DHORME, *Le Livre de Job*, p. 213; G. HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 38; S. R. DRIVER and G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Job* (Intern. Crit. Comm.), p. 145 (and philol. notes, p. 105).

⁴ *Supplement to a Palestinian Syriac Lectionary*, ed. A. S. LEWIS, p. 6.

⁵ Cp. NACHMANIDES at Ex. xxii, 28 (quoted by PERLES, *op. cit.*, p. 81).

"a mass, multitude of shepherds,"¹ Both in the verb and in the noun we have then the meaning "mass, crowd."

We may now turn to another passage, which is not mentioned by Perles, but which is important for our discussion, viz., Jer. xii, 6, of which the Hebrew text is as follows:

כי נמ־אחיד ובית־אביר נמ־המה בנרו בכ נמ־המה קראו אחר־ך מלא
אל־תאמן בם כי ידברו אליך טובות:

In the R.V. this verse is translated:

"For even thy brethren, and the house of thy father, even they have dealt treacherously with thee; even they have cried aloud after thee; believe them not, though they speak fair words unto thee."

The translation of מלא "they have cried aloud" is the same as is given by the Revisers to קראו מלא in Jer. iv, 5, and it is the translation which is usually to be found in commentaries.² But the translation of the A.V. seems to be more correct—"they have called a multitude after thee,"³ i.e., Jeremiah's kinsmen have raised a hue and cry after him, they have massed together to hunt him down. For this translation the vowels of מלא need to be altered so as to read either *melo'* "mass, multitude," which will then be direct object after קראו ("they have called after thee a multitude"), or *malle*⁴ (Pi. infin. absolute) "they have called after thee, mustering," the implied object being the members of the tribe. That this is the sense of the phrase is shown by the rendering of it by the LXX. Their translation is—*eboēsan, ek tōn opisō sou episunēchthēsan*. The last word *episunēchthēsan* "are gathered together" renders מלא.⁵ Rashi⁶ and Qimhi⁷ further support this meaning of מלא here. Streane⁸ remarks that the LXX, in spite of rendering מלא successfully in Jer. iv, 5, failed to see the force of מלא here. It seems more probable, however, that the reverse is the case—they saw the force of מלא here, but failed to see the force of it in iv, 5. There is thus no need to emend the text in this passage, as some commentators have done.⁹

Before we proceed to consider מלא in Jer. iv, 5, we must refer briefly to the use in Arabic of the word *mala'a*, with which the Hebrew מלא is cognate. This Arabic word means "filled," and

¹ See BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, p. 571.

² GIESEBRECHT, *op. cit.*, p. 73; DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 116, *et al.*

³ Marg. "they cried after thee fully."

⁴ Cp. DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 116; J. BARTH, *Die Nominalbild. in d. sem. Sprachen*, p. 14f, regards *mala'* as equivalent to the Arabic infin. (*qatil* form) in an abstract sense "Fülle"; cp. C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss. d. vergleich. Gramm. d. sem. Sprachen*, i, p. 337.

⁵ See further VOLZ, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁶ קבוץ אנשים

⁷ קבוץ כלומר התקבצו אחר־ך

⁸ *The Double Text of Jeremiah*, p. 136.

⁹ So, e.g., VOLZ, *op. cit.*, p. 107; RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

in the sixth form means "aided, assisted one another to do a thing."¹ Schultens² compared this sixth form with **יַמְלִאוּן** in Job xvi, 10; and Hitzig,³ in reference to the same passage, drew attention to the Arabic phrase *tamala'u* 'ala qatlihi "they massed together to kill him."⁴ The Arabic noun *mala'un* means "assembly," the same word as the Hebrew **מְלוּא**, which we have already seen has this meaning in Gen. xlviii, 19 and Is. xxxi, 4. It is used in this sense in the Qoran, in Sura ii, 247 and Sura xi, 40. With this use of *mala'un* and **מְלוּא** we may compare the Syriac *mulaya* "coetus"⁵ and *mela'a* "frequentia,"⁶ and in all probability the Accadian *millu* "band, company"⁷ belongs here. The Accadian *mu'du* (=Hebrew **מֵאד**) means "fulness, mass, crowd,"⁸ and provides a parallel to the double meaning which we have in the Hebrew **מְלוּא** "fulness, crowd."

We have so far seen reason to think that a study of the Hebrew text of Jer. li, 11, xii, 6; Job xvi, 10; Gen. xlviii, 19; and Is. xxxi, 4, in combination with the ancient versions, with the testimony of some Jewish commentators, and with the evidence of other Semitic languages, leads to the conclusion that the Hebrew root **מִלָּא** can be used in the sense of "collect, assemble, mass," and that the noun **מְלוּא** can mean "multitude, mass." It is not difficult to see how closely related are the ideas of "being full, fill"—**מָלָא** in Hebrew is used both transitively and intransitively,⁹ as are the corresponding roots in Accadian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic—and the idea of "assemble, mass." People who "fill" a room "mass, assemble" in it; troops "mass" and "fill" (a breach), and so on. With this much clear, we are now in a better position to consider more closely the meaning of the phrase **קְרָאוּ מְלוּא** in Jer. iv, 5. As I said earlier, the translation "cry aloud" is to be rejected. The implied object of **מִלָּא** is not, as this translation would require, **קוֹל** "voice," but rather **מְלוּא** which is then a cognate accusative after **מִלָּא**. The phrase **קְרָאוּ מְלוּא** means literally "proclaim, assemble

¹ LANE, *Arab. Eng. Lex.*, p. 2729. For the biliteral *ml* in verbs meaning "collect, heap up," see J. FÜRST, *Hebr. u. Chald. Wörterb. über das A.T.*, I, p. 736; ii, p. 39.

² *Commentarius in librum Jobi*, 1773, p. 374.

³ *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 123.

⁴ See F. A. ARNOLD, *Amrilkaisi Carmen (quartum)*, 1836, p. 2f.

⁵ PAYNE SMITH, *Thes. Syr.*, p. 2124.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2126.

⁷ See F. DELITZSCH, *Assyr. Handwörterb.*, p. 414; cp. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *A Concise Dict. of the Assyr. Lang.*, p. 545. The equation of the Egyptian *mrt* "common people, peasants," or the like, with the Arabic *mala'un* "assembly, crowd," is very doubtful; see A. ERMAN, *Zeitschr. d. deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xli (1892); p. 112.

⁸ MUSS-ARNOLT, *op. cit.*, p. 507.

⁹ A. RAHLFS thinks that originally there must have been in Hebrew, as in Arabic, two roots, *male'* "be full" and *mala'* "fill," and that the former, because of its greater frequency, has absorbed the latter. See *Festschrift Friedrich Carl Andreas*, Leipzig, 1916, p. 135f.

a מלאו " i.e., "assemble an assembly," a phrase which is equivalent to "proclaim mobilisation," "proclaim a muster" (of troops). The imperative מלאו stands in an asyndetous construction with קראו, and may be regarded as an example of a declarative Pi.¹ The Pi. may thus be taken to mean "declare mobilisation." So a word in common use meaning "be full, fill," has come to be used in the meaning "assemble," and here in Jer. iv, 5 we may see it applied in a military situation to mean the assembling for military purposes of available man power. In this passage a certain sequence may be traced. First, there is the blowing of the trumpet—a signal of danger, whether from the Scythians or from later invaders—and this is followed by mobilisation, an idea expressed again in the following האספו. Both Rashi and Qimḥi explain מלאו here by אסיפה "a gathering together," and the A.V. renders it by "gather together."

It is of some interest to note that המצודה, the citadel in Jerusalem, to which reference is made in 2 Sam. v, 9, etc., is explained by Qimḥi as a place where the people assembled. What he says is—"המצודה is a place adjoining a wall and the place was broad for people to assemble there; therefore it is called מלאו."² It is not necessarily to be claimed that Qimḥi's explanation is correct, but the basis of his explanation, viz., that מלאו is to be connected with מלא in the special sense of "assemble" is at least noteworthy for our present discussion.

In conclusion, some considerations of general interest which arise from this brief paper may be pointed out. First, it may be noted how, as frequently, the LXX and Syriac versions have preserved the correct meaning of a Hebrew word. The translators knew that מלאו could mean "assemble, gather together," as also did the Jewish scholars to whom reference has been made. Secondly, as is often the case, the meaning given to a Hebrew word by the ancient versions finds corroboration in cognate words in other Semitic languages. Thirdly, the correct understanding of the meaning of מלאו makes unnecessary the emendations which have been proposed in Jer. iv, 5, xii, 6, and li, 11. Once again it may be observed how the correct meaning of the Hebrew text as it stands can be recovered by the application of proved methods of investigation. Fourthly, if our interpretation of מלאו in Jer. iv, 5 is correct, we catch a fresh glimpse into the military vocabulary of the ancient Hebrews. We now know a new way in which they expressed the idea of mobilising troops. And lastly, the concentration of attention upon the problems presented by a single

¹ For this type of Pi., see GESENIUS, *Hebr. Gramm.* (KAUTZSCH-COWLEY), 2nd ed., p. 141.

² On 2 Sam., v, 9—מלאו הוא מקום סמוך לחומה ואותו המקום היתה רחבה להאסף העם שם. לפיכך נקרא מלאו כמו קראו מלאו ואמרו האספו. His explanation at I Ki, xi, 27 and I Chr. xi, 8 is given in similar terms.

Hebrew word may appear a small matter when compared with the larger themes which have been the subjects of papers at the meetings of our Society. It is, however, perhaps well that we should be reminded from time to time that the work of the textual critic and the Semitic philologist is fundamental to all our studies. Without firm bases achieved along these lines of study, sound exegesis of the Old Testament is not to be attained.

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

JESUS IN THE HABAKKUK SCROLL

The question whether the expression מורה הצדק in the Habakkuk Scroll refers to Jesus—as has been asserted¹—was recently discussed by G. Vermes in what is a lucid and very instructive article.² Vermes' conclusions are diametrically opposed to mine: he maintains that מורה הצדק in the Habakkuk Scroll cannot be identified with Jesus and indeed that the Habakkuk Scroll cannot be ascribed to Christian or even Jewish-Christian inspiration.³

It is important, however, to observe that nothing confirms better the identity of מורה הצדק with Jesus than the arguments used by Vermes himself to the contrary.

According to Vermes there is an essential difference between מורה הצדק and Jesus:

"The Teacher of Justice [מורה הצדק], although considered by his disciples a great prophet, sought only to *instruct* them concerning the end of the world as prophesied by the seers of Israel.

"Jesus, on the contrary, as is witnessed by the New Testament, is fully conscious of the fact that his mission is to *fulfil* those prophecies which concerned him personally. He is the *first object* of these prophecies; he knows their most hidden meaning—the more so, since, according to I Peter i, 14 it is his Spirit (*pneuma christou*) that conveyed to the prophets the knowledge of future events."⁴

The difference between the two functions or missions indicated by Vermes is, in fact, essential; and if it were true that the mission of מורה הצדק as described in the Habakkuk Scroll is to instruct his followers "concerning the end of the world as prophesied by the seers of Israel," it would be inadmissible to identify מורה הצדק with Jesus. But it is not true. This mission of "instruction" is, in fact, assigned in the Habakkuk Scroll to the כהן (Priest) and *not* to the מורה הצדק.

¹ See J. L. Teicher, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," etc. *Journal of Jewish Studies*, II, p. 97.

² *Le "Commentaire d'Habacuc" et le Nouveau Testament in Cahiers Sioniens*, V, No. 4, Dec. 1951, pp. 337-349.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 345-347.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 346:

"Le docteur de Justice, quoique considéré comme un grand prophète par ses disciples, ne se proposait que des les *instruire* concernant les événements derniers que les voyants d'Israël avaient annoncés.

"Jesus, par contre, au témoignage du N.T., est pleinement conscient que sa mission consiste à *accomplir* les prophéties, qui le visaient, lui, personnellement. Il est l'*objet premier* des annonces: il les connaît dans leur signification la plus cachée, d'autant plus que, selon *I. Pierre*, i, 11, c'est son Esprit (*pneuma christou*) qui communiqua aux prophètes la connaissance des choses à venir."

In column ii, lines 5-10 of the Habakkuk Scroll we read as follows:

וכן פשר הדבר [על הבן] נדים לאחרית
 הימים המה עריצים אנשי הבר[ית] אשר לוא יאמינו
 בשומעם את כל הבא[נות] על[ה] הדור האחרון מפי
 הכוהן אשר נתן אל ב[לבם] דע[ה] לפשור [א]ת כול
 דברי עבדיו הנביאים [כיא] בידם ספר אל את
 כול הבאות על עמו

"The hidden meaning of the prophecy [Hab. i, 6] now disclosed refers, finally, to those who have no faith in 'the end of the world.' They are the members of the Covenant, full of presumption, who disbelieve when they hear from the mouth of the Priest—to whose mind God has given knowledge [or wisdom] to interpret all the utterances of His servants, the prophets—all the things that will happen to the last generation of men.² For God had revealed³ through the prophets all the things that will happen to His people."

Thus, it is the כוהן, who is the פושר—the apocalyptic interpreter of the prophetic utterances and the teacher who instructs "concerning the end of the world as prophesied by the seers of Israel"—and not the מורה הצדק, as Vermes maintains. "The מורה הצדק is never referred to in our documents (Scrolls and the Damascus Fragments) as כוהן (Priest), and it is utterly arbitrary to say, as Vermes does, that the מורה הצדק is the same person as the כוהן.⁴ The status of the מורה הצדק is quite distinct in the Habakkuk Scroll from that of the כוהן. The מורה הצדק is not an apocalyptic interpreter of prophecies, but the person who knows *all the mysteries* of the prophetic utterances. In fact, we read in column vii, lines 4-5 of the Habakkuk Scroll:

... מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את
 כול רוי דברי עבדיו הנביאים ...

"... the True Teacher,⁵ to whom God revealed all the mysteries contained in the utterances of His servants, the prophets ..."

This description of the מורה הצדק tallies exactly with one of the features assigned, as it will be remembered, by Vermes to

¹ Compare DSD, xi, 15-16: הפוה לרעה לב עברה

² These presumptuous members of the Covenant form the third and last class of disloyal people (הנוגדים) against whom the purport of the verses in Hab. i, 5-6, is directed. The first class are those בוגדים who follow the "Man of Lies" [Col. ii, lines 1-2], that is to say, Paul (see J.J.S. II, p. 98). The second are those who reject the New Covenant הנוגדים בבירה החדשה [lines 3-4].

³ Literally: "had told."

⁴ Op. cit., p. 341: "Ce Prêtre est le Docteur de Justice ..."

⁵ For this rendering of the term מורה הצדק see my article in J.J.S., II, p. 97. It is relevant to point out in this connection that the word צדק in Is. xli, 26, is rendered in the lxxx as *alethe estin*.

Jesus, namely, that "he knows the most hidden meaning of the prophetic utterances." Must we not then conclude that on this score alone the מורה הצדק in the Habakkuk Scroll is Jesus?

It must be, further, conceded that the description of the מורה הצדק in the Habakkuk Scroll implies that there is a unique relationship between him and the prophetic utterances. He alone knows *all the mysteries* contained in the prophetic utterances. Would it be too much to say that he embodies them and that he is aware of this fact? In any case, the statement about the מורה הצדק in the Scroll coincides in some measure with the other features assigned by Vermes to Jesus, namely, that he was conscious of his mission "to fulfil the prophecies." It coincides in some measure only, because the statement in the Scroll lacks the explicit reference to the True Teacher's consciousness of his own mission. But can it be forgotten that, as regards Jesus, we have preserved in the Gospel his clear and direct words and that the statement in the Habakkuk Scroll about the מורה הצדק is not his own personal declaration?

The third feature indicated by Vermes that Jesus' spirit "conveyed to the prophets the knowledge of future events" is not contained in the Habakkuk Scroll. But, why should it be contained there? Is it reasonable to expect to find in the Habakkuk Scroll (a pre-canonical polemical writing, composed by the Hebrew-Christians in Jerusalem before 70 C.E.)¹ *all* the features of Jesus that are contained in the canonical and post-canonical writings? Only through a kind of anachronistic myopia can we deny the identity of the מורה הצדק with Jesus on the ground that the former does not exhibit *every* traditional characteristic of the latter.

Let us now go a step further. Vermes makes in his article a most illuminating observation about a neglected aspect of the activity or function of the apostolic teachers. Quoting Luke xxiv, 26-27, 45; Rom. xvi, 25-26; and Ephes. v, 31-32, he shows that the apostles were in a significant sense the "apocalyptic" interpreters of the Hebrew Bible. They may truly be called: פושרים.²

In the light of this observation is it easy to establish clearly the true purport of the arguments used by Vermes to deny the identity of the מורה הצדק with Jesus. The distinction made by Vermes between the status of Jesus and that of the מורה הצדק is, in fact, the distinction between Jesus and the apostles. It coincides exactly with the distinction between the מורה הצדק and the כוהן-פושר that is clearly inculcated in the Habakkuk Scroll. The מורה הצדק is, thus, Jesus, and the כוהן, apostle.³ Q.E.D.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

¹ See my article in *J.J.S.*, II, pp. 131-132.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 345-346. Vermes' elucidation of the apostolic type of exegesis is most instructive.

³ See *J.J.S.*, II, p. 131, note 4, concerning the equation כוהן—apostle.

NEW NOTES ON PRE-EXPULSION ANGLO-JEWISH SCHOLARS

Through its publication in its second issue (vol. I, pp. 67-81) of my notes on the thirteenth-century Rabbis Berechiah and Joseph of Lincoln, and more recently (vol. II, pp. 58-60) of an exhaustive review by the Editor of my monograph on the Intellectual Life of Medieval English Jewry (British Academy Supplemental Papers, No. 8) the *Journal of Jewish Studies* has established itself as the ideal clearing-house for new material regarding this subject, so important for our background in this country. It is for that reason that I am venturing to contribute here some further notes upon it, based on material that has recently come to light.

(1) The name of Elijah of London, hardly remembered not so long ago, has now emerged as that of the outstanding Anglo-Jewish scholar and "the most distinguished English Jew of the Middle Ages." Yet another of his independent writings has recently been traced. Dr. Kurt Wilhelm, Chief Rabbi of Sweden, has found in a liturgical MS. in the Library of the University of Upsala, and published in *Tarbiz*, xxii. 43-52, a hitherto unknown commentary from his hand on the Passover Eve Haggadah. It is a characteristic product of the medieval [Anglo-] Franco-German Rabbinic school, and there is no need to enter into a detailed description of it here, the text being now available in print. Two or three points, however, may be accentuated. The codex in which the commentary was found was written in Germany in the fourteenth century; further evidence (if that is needed) that Rabbi Elijah's reputation survived him. Various passages in the composition tally exactly with the prescriptions of the *'Eṣ Hayyim* of R. Jacob ben Judah of London, including a fuller recension of the recipe which we already know for the manufacture of the *Haroseth*. Some of these are quoted in the name of Rabbi M. of London. This would strengthen the hypothesis that Rabbi Menahem *Hazzan* of London was identical with our Rabbi Elijah, or Elijah Menahem. But, as I have pointed out elsewhere, it is difficult to imagine that the person called by his Christian contemporaries *Mestre Elis ju de Londres*, was known in Hebrew literary circles as *both* Elijah Menahem *and* Menahem, and I prefer to equate the latter with another English scholar of the same name whose existence I have demonstrated. The identities of phraseology may well be (as Dr. Wilhelm suggests) due to the fact that Elijah derived his lore from this scholar.

A point of exceptional interest in the newly found Commentary is the fresh evidence it brings of R. Elijah's remarkable intellectual range. In discussing the *Haroseth*, for example, he mentions that it should contain as one of its ingredients the herb called *sunbul* (i.e., valerian, or nard), which he rightly explains as being "like the beard of barley, and it is to be found in the apothecaries' shops" (with which, incidentally, he as a physician had every reason to be familiar). To make his meaning clear, he gives the equivalent in three languages: סנבל in Arabic, פילרמיק in the vernacular (בל"ע —i.e., English?), and סקון in Latin. It is not easy to interpret the last two. The Latin word is superficially reminiscent of *scammonia* (i.e., scammony), which, however, is a purgative, completely unlike valerian in every way; Dr. Wilhelm, on the other hand, conjectures that the word is a corruption of *spicatum*, which would bring it into relation with *spica nardi* or spikenard. The English(?) term might be a popular name; Dr. Charles Singer, whom I have consulted, suggests that "the first element is likely to be some derivative of the Latin *filum* or *fila*, referring to the "beard" of the herb," but is baffled by the rest.¹ However that may be, this is the only evidence I know of an English, or Latin, *la'az* in a medieval rabbinical writing. It may be mentioned at this point that we once find a mention of a medieval Anglo-Jewish charter being written in Latin in Hebrew characters—the only specific instance known to me of what may be termed Judaeo-Latin.²

It is good news to all who are interested in the heritage of medieval Anglo-Jewry that Chief Rabbi Brodie is preparing for the press the full text of the *'Eṣ Hayyim*: an enterprise that has long been contemplated but never yet seriously taken in hand. When the full text of this, by far the most important medieval Anglo-Jewish literary production, is available, the study of the subject will be placed on a completely new footing. Already there is some proof of this fact. In my *Intellectual Activities of Medieval English Jewry* I cite, on the authority of Neubauer (who had inspected the manuscript), a scholar from Northampton, with the improbable initials ריר"ב. Rabbi Brodie very kindly informed me that this is a misreading, and should be ריבר"ף. This reading, which I have now verified by personal inspection, is of exceptional importance

¹ There is a long excursus on "sunbul" in S. MUNTHER'S Hebrew monograph on Shabbetai Donolo (Jerusalem, 1949), pp. 86-7, but it does not give any help in our inquiry.

² *Select Pleas of the Jewish Exchequer*, p. 15.

An opinion of R. Elijah, of London, which I overlooked in my article on him in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, vol. xiv, occurs in MS. F. 12, 27, in Trinity College, Cambridge (marginal note on f. 10b), regarding the question whether the New Moon sacrifice should be mentioned in the musaph-prayer of the New Year: he was of the contrary opinion, since the Torah itself "obscured" it. (והוא' מלוגדש כהן שאין לזכרו כלל מאחר שתורה נסתרה). I am indebted to Mr. Raphael Loewe for verifying this reading. There is a reference in the formula of betrothal on f. 48b of the same MS. to the "Usage of the Isle"—i.e., of England.

for the purpose of our present inquiry. For this scholar is clearly identical with the rabbinical authority mentioned frequently by the same initials, but without any indication of provenance, elsewhere in the *'Eṣ Hayyim* (on one occasion, in connection with local English conditions), and presumably with the R. Isaac ben Pereš cited by Elijah of London and other foreign rabbinical authorities of the time. (I have assembled the data already in *Intellectual Activities*, pp. 42, 53-4.) His date seems to be suggested by the opinion of his cited in the re-examined passage of the *'Eṣ Hayyim*, which concerns his invalidation "in time of war" of the testimony given by a Gentile regarding a Jew's death. There can be little doubt that the reference is to the Barons' Wars in the time of Henry III, in the course of which Northampton was stormed and the Jews were forced to take refuge in the royal castle. This city, regarding whose Jewish community in the Middle Ages little has hitherto been known, now takes its place as a centre of rabbinic learning.

(2) It was already sufficiently obvious that the practices of English Jews were cited as precedents by the rabbinical authorities on the Continent. A further instance of this, from the *Pesaqim* of R. Isaac of Dampierre, has been published now by Professor Asaf in his article in the Jubilee Volume in honour of Alexander Marx (Hebrew Section, p. 13): "I have heard that in the Land of the Island they were accustomed to mix with the cheese curdled whey which they call צנצרון, but I see no reason to forbid it." In the same volume, pp. 377-8, the late Dr. A. H. Freimann (whose tragic death in 1948 on the road to the University in Jerusalem was one of the greatest losses to Jewish scholarship in recent years) published from the manuscript of the *'Eṣ Hayyim* the formula of the marriage contract as known in medieval England. Curiously, the currency specified in this is that of Tours or מיטש, which is as yet unexplained but might be Metz.

(3) For the sake of completeness, I wish to take this opportunity of publishing the original Hebrew text of three extremely interesting passages illustrating the religious usages and social life of medieval English Jewry, hitherto known only from the inadequate English versions included by Joseph Jacobs in his *Jews of Angevin England*. The first (= *J.A.E.*, p. 286) is from the MS. of the *Shibbole Halleqet* in the Cambridge University Library, MS. Add. 653 f. 62a, kindly consulted for me by the Editor, regarding the use of hemp in sewing a woollen garment: ונשוב לענייננו על הנוקדנין המגממין בדבר ומוציאין לעז על הראשונים שנהגו בו היתר מימות אבותיהן בכל ארץ הגולה אשכנו צרפת אינלשיר פרויניצא שכולם לובשים צמר תפורה בקנבם ואין מהם בדבר.

Next come two passages from MS. Montefiore 65 (olim MS. Halberstamm 58, now in the Library of Jews' College, London). The first (f. 48b = *J.A.E.*, p. 269) informs us that for the sake of

good relations English Jews did not object to drinking in the company of Gentiles ; the other (f. 72a = *J.A.E.*, *ibid.*) refers disapprovingly to the use of signet rings embodying the likeness of a human face "such as they now make in England." There does not seem to be any suggestion that the English Jews used these rings, and none of the three or four medieval Anglo-Jewish seals extant is in fact of this description: MS. Montefiore 65, f. 48b: *ותימ' על: מה שמקילים בארץ האי להרגיל לשתות שכר הגוים ועמהן . . . ואולי הואיל וזיה איבה גדולה מרובה אם היו נמנעים אין להחמיר עליהם כל כך.* Fol. 72a: *ומיהו על אותם חותמות שרגילין עכשו לעשות באינגלישרא: ויש בהם פרצוף אדם היה נראה לו איסור בדבר.*

(4) To my list of Hebrew manuscripts now extant which may have been in the possession of English Jews in the Middle Ages there should be added an interesting Psalter in the Bodleian Library (MS. Bodl. Hebr. 3). This, written in a Franco-German (*i.e.*, conceivably English) hand of the thirteenth century was formerly in the possession of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and from the fact that the fly-leaves embody a Canterbury document of the fourteenth century was presumably to be found there (perhaps in the Chapter Library) from the Middle Ages onwards. Neubauer, in his Bodleian Catalogue, points out that there are "at the end Arabic, Russian, Greek, and Hebrew alphabets"; he does not, however, call attention to the amazing fact that the Russian alphabet is accompanied by a transliteration of the names of the letters in *Hebrew characters*, in a relatively early hand. Why a Christian Hebraist should have perpetrated this piece of virtuosity is unfathomable ; if a Jew were responsible (as is hardly conceivable) it would open up new vistas of the range of medieval intellectual interests.¹

(5) Dr. Teicher's generous review of my *Intellectual Activities of English Medieval Jewry*, while adding some useful points to the discussion and raising some certainly justifiable doubts, also introduces one new element of confusion. In discussing R. Benjamin of *qnubrja* (*i.e.*, Cambridge?) he states that "according to MS. Adler 2273, Benjamin was at one time in Germany." This statement is based on the description in the *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Collection of E. N. Adler*, p. 24 ; "Halakhic Compendium ; refers to Benjamin of Canterbury (*sic*) (67b), travelling in Germany (*ib.*) etc." Clearly, the travels are not on the part of R. Benjamin. As it happens, the folio in question is reproduced at the end of the catalogue, as illustration 99, and there is certainly no reference here to the rabbi's journeyings. It must be conceded, on the other

¹ Cf. CRASTER, *A Hebrew Psalter*, in *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, iii, 68-70. This writer dates the Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic alphabets (but not the cyrillic with its transcription, obviously a later addition) to the thirteenth century, and suggests that they may be by the same hand as the correspondence in MS. Toulouse 902.

hand, that his English association is, to say the least, uncertain. In the same issue of the *Journal of Jewish Studies* there is a review by R. Loewe of the new volume of Rabbi Gaguine's *Kether Shem Tobh*, in which he refers to the reported translation of the Passover Haggadah into the vernacular for the benefit of the women and children, by R. I..... of Londres. I have discussed the passage in *Intellectual Activities*, p. 56, where it will be seen, first, that the authenticity of the passage in question is somewhat dubious, and, secondly, that there is no justification for the amplification of the initial I. into Jacob. I should perhaps mention that there is further consideration of some of these questions, and a certain amount of fresh information on the cultural life of medieval English Jewry generally, in my monograph on the Jews of Medieval Oxford, recently published by the Oxford Historical Society.

(6) In my *Intellectual Activities*, I suggested that "Rubi Gotsce" (= Rabbi Joseph) or "Rubi," *tout court*, who is frequently mentioned in the English records in the middle of the twelfth century, must have been the outstanding scholar of the period, and accepted the hypothesis that he was identical with R. Joseph ben Jacob, the patron and pupil of Ibn Ezra. I still see no reason to doubt this. It has, however, now become clear, from the newly published Memorandum Roll of 1199, that the slightly mysterious office of Archpresbyter of English Jewry goes back some years before the first recorded appointment in that year, at least to 1182. The holder of the office, as seems clear, was at the same time an outstanding businessman and an authority on matters Jewish (including Jewish law, to the extent that it was necessary for administrative and Exchequer purposes): and from 1207 to 1236 it was filled by Rubi Gotsce's grandson, Josce f. Isaac (the hereditary tendency in medieval Jewish offices is notorious). For all these reasons, I am now inclined to believe that "Rubi Gotsce" filled these functions (even if he was not formally appointed to the office) as early as the reign of Henry I, and that the title of "Rubi" or "Rabbi" by which he was generally known denoted this, being, as it were, the equivalent of "Presbyter."

(7) A final point, with a somewhat remoter connection with my subject, but as I think of remarkable general interest. In the published volume of *Select Pleas of the Exchequer of the Jews* (ed. Rigg), pp. 65-7, there is the record of an extraordinarily interesting law-suit between a London Jew and the Prior of the New Hospital without Bishopsgate, the outcome of which revolved partly on the problem, whether the former had been justified in charging interest to a coreligionist, which, according to the Prior, was illegal according to Jewish law. The Jew retorted that in the form stipulated it was permissible, adding that "si predicto Priori videatur hoc ei injustum esse, eat in capitulo coram Magistris de Lege sua, et ibi eum implacitet, quia alibi hujusmodi tangenti

legem suam non debent emendari." Is this mere sarcasm? or was it seriously proposed that the Prior should appear before the Beth Din? In the latter case we have a demonstration of Jewish autonomy and the authority of Jewish law in medieval England, not only over Jews, such as I think can be paralleled nowhere else.

C. ROTH.

Oxford.

ISAAC OF TROKI AND CHRISTIAN CONTROVERSY IN THE XVI CENTURY*

It is just a hundred years ago since Moses Mocatta, a patron of Jewish learning and literature, put his signature to the last work of his long and laborious life: to an English translation made for the sake of Jewish youth "for their perfect conviction of the truth and purity of our holy faith, and weapons of defence against the obtrusive efforts of overzealous proselyte-seekers. . . ." The book was destined for private circulation only. It would have been rather unwise to publish it in 1851, a few years before the final campaign for emancipation of the Jews in the United Kingdom. It was only in 1866, nine years after Mocatta's death, that his family presented the British Museum with a copy of this dangerous book. The book was "Hizzuq 'Emunah," by Isaac of Troki, a Karaite scholar of the sixteenth century.

It was in 1820 that the Rev. Thomas Jarret wrote from Madras to the central missionary body in London about the difficulties encountered among the black and white Jews of Cochin who seemed to be well versed—indeed too well versed—in the subtleties of the Jewish-Christian controversy and in New Testament criticism. At the bottom of the trouble was a single book of an old scholar from a distant Lithuanian township—the "Hizzuq 'Emunah."

There are two heavy volumes of "A Manual of Christian Evidence for Jewish People" published in 1911 and again in 1920 by a modern Cambridge scholar, the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, to combat arguments propounded 350 years ago in an obscure Lithuanian *beth ha-midrash*, the arguments of "Hizzuq 'Emunah."

What then, was this book, who was the writer whose work preserved such amazing vitality over a span of a third of a millennium, over three continents, and over widely divergent systems of learning and culture?

*The following paper was read before the Society for Jewish Study on December 11, 1951, and is published here by the courtesy of the Society. I am fully aware that the paper deals only with some of the problems connected with the subject, and that many of my statements are either controversial or stand in a marked opposition to extant studies. The form of a lecture prevented me, however, both from presenting the subject in its fullness, and from developing all the pros and contras. In many places even the disagreement of my conclusions with those of former biographers of Isaac of Troki is not mentioned. I do not regard this paper as a definitive solution; it reflects only the present state of my research, and I am aware that it cannot be considered complete. It is my intention, indeed, to return to the subject if an opportunity is granted to me to pursue my research.

Not being a Hebrew scholar, I do not presume to solve all the problems connected with "Hizzuq 'Emunah"; what I propose, is only to fit Isaac of Troki and his work into the historical pattern of his Christian environment, and to present "Hizzuq 'Emunah" as a reaction against its cultural and religious impact.

I

The scene shifts to Troki, a charming little township on a lake which reflects the trees of the surrounding forests, away from trade routes and from the busy life of the capital city of Vilna. A Greek-Orthodox monastery and Catholic churches stood side by side with a Karaite kenessah and a Tartar mosque. The Greek-Orthodox and Roman Catholic, Jewish and Muslim burghers used to meet with Reformed gentry and Lutheran merchants flocking to Troki for courts and annual fairs. And all around Troki, in Lithuanian villages, among the serfs, old pagan cults still lingered on—even to the end of the eighteenth century. Ruthenian and Poles, Karaites and Tartars enjoyed full equality and self-government, and the mayor of the "Jewish town" worked hand in hand with the Polish and Tartar mayors of the three "towns" of Troki.

With its composite body of self-governing "nations" and religions, Troki was a microcosm of the mighty Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth which formed the backbone of sixteenth-century Europe, a dividing and connecting link between the Greek-Byzantine and Latin worlds. And the century in which Isaac lived and wrote, was a century of intellectual ferment and political reconstruction. Out of the so-called "execution of laws" movement, led by the gentry against the royal authority and the nobility, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was emerging as a republic ruled by the landed gentry in Parliament, and headed by an elective president with the title of king. In this process, the lead was taken by the Polish gentry, while in Lithuania which had for only a century been linked with Poland and Western culture, the magnates were the much stronger party and the gentry were rather immature both politically and culturally. The Lithuanian Empire was Lithuanian only in name: it was built up from Russian territories, it had a predominantly Ruthenian population, and its cultural and legal language was the White-Ruthenian dialect. It is true, the languishing West Russian culture was receding before the progress of West European culture—Roman Catholic in its religious expression and Polish in its national form. After the dynastic union of Poland and Lithuania had been transformed in 1569 into an organic union, the process of polonisation rapidly swept the upper classes of the Lithuanian and Ruthenian population.

It is in relation to the background of this Commonwealth that we must look at the life of Isaac of Troki. We are accustomed to think of East European Jewry in terms of ghetto social discrimination and cultural exclusiveness. But these features were imported into Lithuania by the later influx of Western Jews. The Lithuanian Jew of the sixteenth century was not an "infidel" or "perfidious Jew," as his Polish brother used to be, but *zhid pan* (Sir Jew) so-and-so, or even *zhid yeho milost' pan* (His Honour the Jew Sir . . .), the forms of address similar to those used for knights and nobles. Lithuanian Jews were known for their studies in the liberal arts and in science, and were regarded as promoters of learning in the country. But above all, they formed a social group on whom the great dukes of Lithuania relied in their endeavour to build up a unified and efficient financial and economic administration. In the first half of the century, it seemed for a while as if the Jews were about to grow into the *noblesse de robe* of the Lithuanian State. But this brought them into conflict with the burghers of the rapidly growing towns and cities, as well as with the gentry who were contesting their posts in the administration of the country. And above all the progressive westernisation of Lithuania was leaving the Jews behind and pushing them down to a position of cultural and social inferiority.

But this was yet hardly felt in Isaac's times. The growing wealth and authority of Jewish communities, their flourishing talmudic schools, their efficient self-government—all this spoke of growth and strength, and the menacing signs were concealed by every appearance of well-being.

Nor were these signs of warning very clear to the little Karaite community of Troki which in the years of Isaac's youth was rapidly recovering its status and position after the exile of 1495-1503, shared with their "brethren the Rabbanites"—as the Karaites used to write in their official correspondence. The town, an ancient residence of Lithuanian dukes and their strongest fortress, had lost its political and strategic significance. Instead, it grew into the capital of the European Karaites. The community of Kiev, which had previously been a rallying point of Continental Karaites and a link between them and the leading community of Constantinople, declined with the downfall of this ancient Russian capital; but with its last breath of life it kindled the fire of a cultural and religious revolution in Russian countries. Its leadership fell to Troki. This young community, founded only at the beginning of the fifteenth century, evinced an amazing cultural vitality. Lithuanian Karaites of the sixteenth century still lived in the age of manuscript literature, while their Rabbanite countrymen were already in the midst of the age of printing. But the literary activities and eagerness of the little Karaite community were certainly incommensurate with its numerical strength.

The links between Lithuanian and Crimean Karaites, if not completely severed, were weakened after the Lithuanian Empire had lost its hold on the Black Sea shores. Close connections were, nevertheless, maintained with Constantinople, the centre of Karaite learning, and there was a lively exchange of men and manuscripts between the two communities. This close connection did not prevent Troki from gaining its spiritual independence and from imposing its indisputable authority on all Lithuanian-Ruthenian communities. Both this independence and authority were growing steadily with the mounting stress between Poland and Turkey.

At the same time, there was a close dependence on the Rabbinites. The term "Jew" in Lithuania of the sixteenth century had the same juridical meaning in respect of both the Rabbanites and Karaites; it included the smaller community within the general pattern of Jewish self-government and administration.

This connection with the Rabbanites facilitated the study of Hebrew and enhanced the spiritual links between the two communities. The Troki Karaites kept up in addition—much more than those in other centres—their old Tartar dialect. This fact was perhaps due to their Tartar neighbours, despite the fact that the Lithuanian Tartars themselves were exchanging already their own language for that of their Ruthenian neighbours, and even wrote their scanty koranic literature in the White-Ruthenian dialect, although in Arabic characters.

More remarkable is the fact that the Troki Karaites, who certainly were not ignorant of the official White-Ruthenian language of the Lithuanian State, accepted Polish as their third cultural language. Their social status was responsible for this: as free farmers, as merchants, and as treasury officials, they were probably nearer to the gentry, at that time undergoing the process of polonisation, than to Lithuanian peasants or Ruthenian townfolk.

II

In this community Isaac ben Abraham was born, probably in 1525, one of the numerous progeny of Abraham ben Aaron Toroki ha-Hazzan, to continue the literary and scholarly traditions of his family. It is one of the paradoxes of the history of letters that the book which won for its author international fame, which was read and was the subject of strenuous opposition in three continents and over three centuries, was written by a man who lived in a forsaken corner of a backward country, and whose scholarly equipment was limited to that with which his narrow field of life was able to provide him. He spent his school years in his native town, at the feet of local scholars—Šephanyah ben Mordecai, the Troki "hazzan" and a doctor of renown, and his disciple Isaac ben Israel, both of

whom were good Hebrew scholars and students not only of Karaite lore, but of rabbinical learning as well.

The years of Isaac's manhood fell in the period when his country was undergoing political and cultural reconstruction. Lithuanian Jewry responded to the general trend and organised themselves to protect their common interests. The Karaites followed the lead of their Rabbanite brethren, and in their congress of 1553 established a central representative body. It was then that Isaac of Troki—a man of 27—made his appearance as one of the leading personalities of the Karaite community. He was made secretary of the congress, and elected one of the Troki dayanim appointed to represent Karaite interests, both local and general, in dealings with the State, with the Christian churches, and with other Jewish representative bodies.

This was the beginning of Isaac's political and spiritual leadership of his community which lasted for thirty years. The few documents preserved show him busy with Rabbanite representative bodies, with the Lithuanian Parliaments, working for confirmation of privileges and liberties, travelling in Lithuania proper and in Samogitia; and above all busy with fixing the calendar and with the juridical and ritual problems of the Karaite communities in Lithuania and Volhynia which regarded him as their recognised and undisputed spiritual leader.

Under his leadership, Troki grew into a capital of Karaite learning. He seems to have been in favour with the Lord-Lieutenant of Troki, Prince Zbaraski, who granted him a privilege for a *beth ha-midrash* in 1576. It was in this school that a generation of scholars grew up who became responsible for the highest achievements of Karaite literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Isaac ben Abraham was not only a man of learning, a talented Hebrew and Tartar poet, and a skilful politician. It was his personality as well: his broad and humane tolerance, his noble urbanity, his warm benevolence and personal interest in his friends and neighbours, and his passionate love of the Jewish past and present coupled with true loyalty towards his Lithuanian homeland, made him not only respected and followed but loved throughout his life, and lamented after his death.

He died probably in 1586, in the midst of his family and in the presence of his young disciple and spiritual heir Joseph ben Mordecai ha-Qodesh Malinowski. It was Joseph who said farewell over his grave, and later on, in his mature years, inherited and continued his teacher's leadership. And it was to him that fell the task of editing and publishing his master's life work, "*Hizzuq 'Emanah*."

These are the scanty facts concerning Isaac's life that can be gathered from the extant documents and other contemporary sources. Much more can be said about his learning and his ideas.

III

The "Hizzuq 'Emunah" shows such definite influence of talmudic and rabbinical literature that its current text is held by most historians to be the product of a Rabbanite pen. We have, however—apart from the incompletely known text of the original Malinowski's edition—the testimony to the contrary of Isaac himself. The Karaite scholar wrote with pride in one of his letters: "in my heart there lie the foundations of the Torah, the mysteries of the Bible, and enigmas of the Gemarah." In his preoccupation with talmudic learning he only followed the lead of Eliyah Bashyaşi of Adrianople (about 1420-90), the greatest codifier of the Karaite lore, and he bequeathed his interest in rabbinical literature to the generation of his disciples. The correspondence of Doctor Joseph Salomo Delmedigo, an outstanding Jewish scholar of the seventeenth century, with Zarah ben Nathan of Troki, one of Joseph Malinowski's disciples, proves how desperate were the more enterprising intellects among the Troki scholars about the narrowness of the Karaite lore, and with what a relief they were finding answers to their problems in the contemporary Rabbanite literature. Isaac himself liked to parade his talmudic quotations in his correspondence. The language and style of Hebrew and even Tartar poetry of the Troki school, with its fondness for wordplay, puns, and alliterations—all this seems to show the influence of Rabbanite learning.

It does not seem as if Isaac was in touch with either the flourishing talmudic school at Brest, in Lithuania, or with the spreading pilpul methods of the Cracow school, or with the philosophical trend represented by his great contemporary, Moses Isserles, of Cracow. The curriculum of Isaac's Rabbanite learning appears rather to be limited to those authors who were in the hands of the Oriental Jews, and it might not be a gratuitous guess that he relied on manuscripts brought to Troki by those scholars who at the end of the fifteenth century had been studying at Constantinople.

Of course, the Karaite scholar treated talmudic and rabbinic writings in much the same way as a Protestant divine would use the Fathers and great scholastic authors: with respect, but as a source of authority to be approached with careful discrimination.

Beside his spiritual duties, Isaac had to attend to many a worldly business of his small community, particularly in respect to the safeguarding of its privileges and liberties. His writings show that in frequent contacts with local and central administrative bodies, with Parliamentary life and with influential magnates, he acquired a good grasp of the rather tangled web of Polish and Lithuanian common law, the so called Magdeburg municipal statutes, and the romanising tendencies of the Lithuanian law reform movement of the sixties and seventies of his century.

It was not only in the Jewish lore and the practical knowledge of law that he was interested. He was—for instance—open-minded enough to appreciate Gentile learning, and, in conformity with the humanist spirit of his age recognised its educational and moral values. While treating Islam and the Muslims with open enmity and scorn, he wrote with appreciation of Christian cultural achievement: “Not so the Edomite race which, addicted to studies in the profane philosophy, knows the turpitude of conceit and the dignity of modesty.” And apparently, he regarded this profane philosophy as also useful to himself.

True, his learning and reading were neither extensive nor comprehensive. He wrote good Hebrew and powerful Tartar. He certainly knew and spoke White-Ruthenian, the legal language of the country. But beside Hebrew, he read only Polish books. Contrary to the assertions of most Jewish historians, he was ignorant of Latin. Even later, when under his influence Troki grew into a considerable centre of Karaite learning, there were no Latin scholars there, and, for example, Zerah ben Nathan had to seek the assistance of a Protestant friend to have excerpts from a Latin book translated into Polish. In Isaac’s book there is occasional mention of Latin writings and of Latin versions of the Bible, but all this can be traced easily to Polish translations or to quotations in Polish books. What is more, Isaac was clearly unable to understand such Latin quotations in the text of these books which would have fitted perfectly his own arguments.

All his knowledge of Gentile lore was limited to contemporary Polish literature. He certainly must have been fond of history, and there is an unmistakable historical thread in his way of thinking. He was well read in such medieval Jewish historians as the so-called Yossipon and in the *Sepher Haqqabalah* by RABD (Rabbi Abraham ben David). But his favourite book and his main source of historical knowledge was the great Polish “Chronicle of the World” (Cracow 1554) by Martin Bielski, the first Polish historian who wrote in Polish. And that is all—as far as we can ascertain. Owing to this rather sketchy knowledge of the Gentile past, Isaac was liable sometime to confuse historical issues, and in the “*Hizzuq Emunah*” there are a few rather curious errors.

Nevertheless, he made an excellent use of his scanty erudition. He had a remarkable grasp of the essentials, and in his hands even fragmentary knowledge turned into a powerful weapon of controversy.

IV

“... As in my youth I had sometimes access to lords and nobles, to their courts and palaces”—he wrote—“I had the opportunity to learn the errors in works written by them, to hear them making wrong assertions, going about with strange opinions and vain

hypotheses, and in general delivering many impudent speeches. Nevertheless, in spite of their unwisdom, they opened their mouths against me, without regard to their small knowledge, uttered many words in order to quote weak proofs out of their own teaching, and to raise deceitful contradictions and difficulties out of the words of the Prophets and of the Holy Writ . . . and based on them, they let themselves be enticed by error and false inferences, so as to rise against the Almighty . . . In my youth . . . and even throughout my life, I used to discuss with high clergy and lords, with noble magistrates and outstanding scholars, and with everyone indeed who appeared to be disposed to enter into a discussion with me. And they did not offend me, because I used to address them with kindness and in mild and endearing words, and not in words of quarrel and dispute. Not only did they not put me to shame, but listening to my words and arguments and replies, they loved me the better."

I think we may believe him. But who were Isaac's opponents, and what did they discuss with him?

The great political movement in Poland and Lithuania had its religious aspect as well. The gentry strove to eliminate the Church both as an ally of the royal power and of the nobility, and as a political factor encroaching upon their self-government and their parliamentary regime. In the course of this struggle they tended to embrace Protestantism—not its Lutheran brand which was making religion an administrative function of the State, but the Swiss, the Zwinglian and Calvinist brand which was transforming the Church into bodies of voluntary members, self-governing and independent of the State. In Lithuania, there were both the magnates who wanted to strengthen their political position by usurping the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, and, on the other hand, the Greek-Orthodox gentry who were ready to embrace Western culture, but not in its Catholic religious aspect.

The libertarian strain which underlay the constitutional issues of the movement was the most outstanding feature of the Polish and Lithuanian reformation. It found its constitutional expression in the so-called Warsaw Covenant of 1573 in which all the "dissenters in religion"—*i.e.*, both the Roman Catholics and other religious parties—not only granted to each other full religious freedom and security, but virtually pledged themselves not to use any form of religious compulsion against their subjects and serfs. In other countries Protestantism (if not a tolerated nuisance) froze into compulsory religious codes, and free religious thought had either to accept revolutionary issues (as in Germany and in the Netherlands), or to retreat into the underground of mysticism.

Not so in Poland and Lithuania. On the one hand, the libertarian trend found its expression in a peculiar form of Polish interdenominational unionism which gave a powerful impulse to the oecumenical Protestant movement in Western Europe in the seventeenth century.

On the other hand, it allowed the humanist rationalist trend to develop inside Polish and Lithuanian Protestantism. It was on Polish soil that the critical work of Lorenzo de Valla, of Castellio and Erasmus of Rotterdam bore fruit in the rationalist movement which rejected the dogma of the Trinity in the name of reason and revealed monotheism. Under the leadership of Fausto Sozzini, the movement culminated in Unitarianism which later on moulded religious thought in England and North America. In Poland, the insistence on reason and Bible lead not only to the criticism of the basic doctrine of traditional Christianity, but to clearly judaising tendencies as well.

Furthermore, the humanist heritage which opposed the moral issues of Torah (as interpreted by Orthodox Christianity) to Charity and the Bible to the Gospel, was to a great extent responsible for the development of radical humanitarian tendencies inside the Polish antitrinitarian movement. Integral pacifism, rejection of capital punishment, refusal to exercise any form of lay authority, condemnation of slavery and of the exploitation of human labour—all this is similar to the pattern of Western European sectarianism. With one difference, however. In Poland, not the poor and oppressed but the rich and privileged, not the unlearned but the intellectuals, rose against the fabric of society and gave their protest that literary expression which deeply influenced trends of social thought in the seventeenth century. In Lithuania, where social conditions were much harsher than in Poland, the rationalist movement flatly refused to endorse the unworldly tendencies of its Polish counterpart.

The elaboration both of the Unitarian doctrine and of its social teaching necessitated the discussion of the relation of the Torah to the Gospel, and in consequence, lead to the discussion of the heritage of Israel. It was only natural that the social trend in Polish antitrinitarianism should have taken up the ideas of Erasmus and based its teaching exclusively on the New Testament.

But, at the same time, the trend which strove to preserve the fabric of contemporary society, had to stress the validity of Law, and thus of the Torah. The result was the discussion on the validity of Judaism which raged between 1567 and 1583, and the development of clearly judaising tendencies both in Poland and in Lithuania. The moderates were called non-Adorants; they recognised Jesus as Messiah, but in the sense of the fulfilment of the moral teaching of the Pentateuch and the Prophets. Their leader was Simon Budny, an outstanding Hebrew scholar whose biblical criticism in many ways anticipated the results of the German historical school of the nineteenth century. There was even a more radical group which stressed the validity of Mosaic ritual law for Christians. These were called in scorn "uncircumcised Jews." There were, in fact, in Vilna and apparently in some other places, cases of circumcision—even among the members of the Reformed Church. Daniel Bielinski of Cracow and his followers, comparing

the Old and the New Testament, found the texts of the Gospels so contradictory, their quotations so inconsistent with the actual text of the Pentateuch and the Prophets, and the Christian doctrine so incompatible with pure monotheism, that eventually they crossed the borders of revealed religion, and centred their teaching on the Decalogue as the historical formula of natural law and natural religion.

All these judaising and anti-Christian tendencies inside Western Protestantism encountered in Lithuania another judaising trend inside the Greek-Orthodox Church. In the fifteenth century, when the destruction of Byzantine culture brought the Greek-Orthodox Church to stagnation, there arose in Lithuania, under the impact of Latin culture, a movement aiming at a renaissance of West-Russian cultural life independent of Rome and of Moscow alike. The Western Renaissance fell back on the treasures of classical antiquity. The West-Russian Renaissance, cut off both from Greece and Rome, appealed to the cultural achievements of Judaism.

With the help of Lithuanian-Ruthenian Jews—both Karaites and Rabbanites—a new scientific and scholarly literature arose which gave a powerful impetus to judaising tendencies which were fast becoming noticeable. Judaism crossed the borders of Lithuania, invaded Novgorod and Moscow, and by the end of the fifteenth century almost succeeded in conquering the Russian Greek-Orthodox Church. The literature created by Jews in Russian remained, however, and as late as the seventeenth century was still eagerly studied in Moscow as a secret learning denounced by the Church and persecuted by the State. In Poland and Lithuania, throughout the sixteenth century—even before the development of the anti-Trinitarian movement—there were a number of similar instances. About the middle of the century, as a result of the suppression of nonconformists in Moscow, a few refugees joined the judaising groups in Lithuania. A new outburst of vehement Greek-Orthodox polemics against Judaism followed in Moscow and in Lithuania.

In such an atmosphere it is small wonder that followers of all the Christian denominations sought to compare their basic beliefs with those of the believers of Torah. The circle of Isaac's friends and opponents consisted mainly of Protestants, but it included members of the Greek-Orthodox Church as well as Roman Catholics. As far as can be inferred from the "*Hizzuq 'Emunah*," his interlocutors were most probably Calvinists who predominated among the Protestant gentry. Isaac seems to have failed to realise the difference between the Calvinists and Lutherans, and—like the common people—called all of them followers of Luther. He knew a great deal about the anti-Trinitarian movement, especially about its non-Adorant fraction. But what he knew of them, seems to indicate that he was not in direct personal touch with their spiritual leader—unless perhaps through Prince Zbaraski who was known as a sympathiser of judaising tendencies. If this was the case, it

is not impossible that it was at the latter's court that Isaac met with the writings of Simon Budny, and that it was there that the discussions started which were to result in the compilation of the "Hizzuq 'Emunah." Most of his opponents seem to have been laymen. True, the arguments proposed by his Greek-Orthodox opponents can be traced to a number of West-Russian polemical works directed against Judaism, but the Greek-Orthodox clergy of Isaac's times lagged far behind the leading elements among lay believers as regards learning. Of the Roman Catholic clergy in Lithuania only a few were interested in the Jewish-Christian controversy. But both the anti-Trinitarian and the Calvinist preachers were not unwilling to confront in argument and discussion the protagonist of Judaism.

Isaac's immediate motive for setting down the results of these discussions in writing arose from the repeated waves of conversion to Christianity among Lithuanian Jews. The first wave came in 1495 when the Jews of Lithuania were ordered to leave the country. The defection of a number of Jewish financiers and officials brought a strain of Jewish blood into the Lithuano-Ruthenian aristocracy. The second wave followed during the period of anti-Jewish reaction which took place in the sixties and grew in extent *pari passu* with the progress of the reconversion of many Protestants to the Roman Catholic Church. This wave seems to have affected a number of Jewish intellectuals whose defection was a heavy loss to the Lithuanian Jewry. Isaac deeply resented the religious helplessness of Jewry in the face of the impact of Gentile culture and he wrote his "Hizzuq 'Emunah" for "everybody who answers to the name of Jew."

All data available show that he had begun gathering his material by the years 1578-79, and that the work was finished by 1585 (not in 1593, as most historians maintain). The work, except for a part of the index, was completed and edited by his disciple Joseph Malinowski in 1594, and it was then that it issued from the Troki *beth ha-midrash* to start on its journey through the years and over the continents.

V

It was an enormous task which Isaac undertook ; to compile a manual of Jewish evidence against the claims of Christianity.

First of all, there was the defence. There was the ever-recurrent argument from the actual situation of the race which had been entrusted with the guardianship of the Law ; the argument of the victors against the vanquished or—as Isaac felt—of the oppressors against the oppressed. Then there was the question of the eventual destination of this race in the light of the Law itself. Did the Law serve the prospects of the future ? Was it still valid ? Were the Jews

living witnesses of the Truth, or dead monuments of the spiritual past of mankind? Has not the Law yielded to the age of Charity, the corporal Law to the spiritual Law? The reply in the positive meant: Jesus Christ.

It is here where Isaac passes from defence to attack. Suppose the existence of Jesus is accepted as an historical fact? Was he necessary to the salvation of mankind? And can he be regarded as Christ from the point of view of a monotheist religion? Charity versus Law? No, the Law is Charity; Charity given effect in, and through, the Law—both by God towards men and by man towards his neighbour. True Charity—so he argued—had been rejected by the Christians both in theory and in practice. The argument ends with a review of various controversial and contradictory passages in the New Testament.

All the controversy, the subject of endless duels since the beginning of Christianity, is here—so to speak—put in a nutshell. The text of “*Hizzuq 'Emunah*” would take only some 150 to 200 pages of print in an average-sized book. The Karaite scholar unfolds his argument with a feeling for essentials and a skill which can only be described as supreme.

Be it noted that this is no detached work of theory, but a reflection of actual problems and practical issues facing the author's generation. Notwithstanding the clear planning of the argument and consequent development of the main issues, the bulk of the problems treated may be traced back to a controversy, which raged not between the Jews and Christians, but between the Christians themselves. Or, to be exact, to the actual controversy between the two trends of the Polish and Lithuanian anti-Trinitarian movement.

As mentioned above, Isaac's knowledge of Gentile literature was rather sketchy. Being master of neither Latin nor Greek, he was unable to follow the trends of European thought, and he had to rely on what he was able to make out from Polish controversial works. Neither was he able to follow the trends of Gentile Biblical criticism, and for his knowledge of both Gentile criticism and of the Gospel he had to fall back on Polish versions of the Bible. True, he made a judicious selection and the best possible use of his material. The text of the Vulgate was known to him through the medium of the second edition of the Roman Catholic Polish version by John of Lwow, the so-called Cracow Bible of 1575; the Greek text through the Protestant version of 1563, the so-called Brest Bible. But he made the most extensive use of the Nieswież version of 1572, by Simon Budny, with his remarkable philological and historical commentary. Budny, the best Hebrew scholar of the century and leader of the non-Adorant faction in Lithuania, arrived in his biblical criticism at conclusions which were only developed by the Protestant scholars four centuries later, and his findings were to a large extent consistent with rabbinical interpretation not only of philological, but of some historical and theological problems

as well. Budny actually admitted the validity of the criticism of the New Testament expressed by judaisers; he admitted divergences between the Gospels themselves, and discrepancies between the Gospels' biblical quotations and the literary and historical meaning of the Pentateuch and the Prophets. To defend Jesus' Messiahship, he had to fall back on the hypothesis of wilful interpolations and technical corruptions in the text of the Gospels. But by doing this, he destroyed many a standard Christian argument in the controversy with the Jews.

Isaac, of course, fully endorsed his emendations, which were opposed both to the Trinitarian foundations of Christianity, and to the doctrine of Jesus being the Messiah. In such a way, playing the Christian teachings and the trends of the Gentile interpretation against each other, Isaac felt himself entitled to tell his opponents: "... your endeavour is aimed not at the knowledge of the Truth, but at litigation in order to get away with the Truth"; and addressing himself to Jewish readers, he goes on "it is the Christians' habit to banter with words of the Revelation torn out of the context without understanding them in order to find proofs for their beliefs, and to do so without taking account of other words of a similar meaning."

His scholarly, but sometimes pungent criticism of the fundamental beliefs of Christianity, his acute analysis of the New Testament cannot but remind one of a great opponent of Christianity and Judaism alike—of Tom Paine, the protagonist of the eighteenth-century Deism, and of his "Age of Reason." This seems to be not a mere coincidence. One is tempted to think that at least some of Tom Paine's ideas might be traced back to writers directly influenced by the "Hizzuq 'Emunah."

There was no common ground between Isaac and his opponents. Christian controversialists accepted the inspiration of Moses and the Prophets on the authority of the Gospel and as far as this seemed to be permitted by the Gospels. Isaac saw in the New Testament an outcrop of the Torah, and treated it as an historical document which stands or fails on its own merits, *i.e.*, by its consistency with the Torah.

This involved the rejection of the apocalyptic parts of the Gospel, but not of the historical existence of Jesus and of his followers. And here it is where the controversy between Budny and Martin Czechowicz steps in: the defence of, and the attack against, the fabric of Christian society of the sixteenth century.

In 1575 Martin Czechowicz, one of the most interesting writers of his generation, published his "Christian talks which are called Dialogues in Greek . . . And a separate section about Jewish lies with which they want to destroy our Lord Jesus Christ and His Gospel." The work embodied all the social doctrine of the movement. As pointed out earlier, this doctrine necessarily involved rejection of the validity of Torah, and thus its exposition naturally

turned into an onslaught on judaising tendencies in Polish anti-Trinitarianism, and on Judaism itself. In opposition to this Budny in 1583 published his work "On the Office of the Sword, or The Confession of our Lord Christ's Church in Lithuania . . . In addition, the defence of the same office against all its adversaries"—an interesting review of all the controversy in the period 1569-81, with a detailed criticism of Czechowicz's doctrine. And, of course, the defence of the social fabric necessitated the defence of the validity and necessity of the Torah—*i.e.*, of the moral teaching of the Torah—for the Christian world.

Here again, Isaac skilfully played up the controversy inside Christianity against Christianity itself. He accepted Budny's defence of the validity of the Law, and by leading the argument to its logical conclusion and by arguing both from Budny's and the Jewish standpoint (which involved the rejection of the doctrine of original sin) he denied the necessity of Jesus Christ's vicarious suffering for mankind, and thus the necessity of Jesus himself. In a true Karaite manner, stressing the literal meaning of the text, he propounded Czechowicz's social doctrine as the logically true teaching of the Gospel—only to show the inconsistency of Christian life and society with their nominal beliefs. On this inconsistency he built up the defence of the spiritual values of the Torah as a fabric of humanitarian morals—an interesting parallel with Thomas More's unwilling appreciation of Mosaic Law in the face of Christian moral practice.

What, then, was Christianity to Isaac? His image of mankind is that of a great spiritual dichotomy, Jew and Gentile, created by the revelation of God to the Jewish people. The Gentile world, again, has two aspects: the Edomite, or the Christian, and the Ishmaelite, or the Muslim. Different in form, they are for him actually two aspects of the historical continuity of paganism. Christianity itself—be it in its Greek or Roman form—is but a development of particular forms of paganism. Combining rabbinical lore with the speculations of humanist historiography, Protestant criticism of Catholic worship with anti-Trinitarian criticism of Protestant doctrines, he accepts and propounds the identity and continuity of classic antiquity, Lithuanian folklore, and Christian culture. He accepts the historical fact of Christianity, but its justification is that of charity, and not of understanding or consent: "I have grown keenly aware," he wrote, "that these superstitions and errors have come to them from their ancestors as if by right of heritage . . . and as they are nurtured in them from their very childhood, and since they are used to them, these errors and superstitions turn into natural things, and they do not seem so absurd to them, since habit is one's other nature."

Isaac did not realise how near the strong humanitarian trend in his teaching brought him to Gentile humanistic ethics, and to their expression in Polish Unitarianism. And there was a reason for this.

Isaac was a Jew of the Jews. Although a Karaite, he never allowed his narrower allegiance to suppress his strong solidarity with the Jewish world. Emotionally, he shared with it the bitterness of the Galut, and he fought with an immense power of feeling for the right of the Jews to the heritage of Israel, the right denied to them by Christendom.

It seems as if his positive teaching was to some extent an unconscious reflection of the Christian vision. He believed in the moral greatness of Israel, and saw this greatness in Israel's vicarious suffering for the sins of nations. The misery of the Galuth was to him the promise and guarantee of the Messianic vision. The personal Messiah receded before the image of the collective Messiah which embodied the features of Jesus Christ and of his Church alike.

Being a Jew, a Lithuanian Jew of the sixteenth century, did not mean to him cutting Israel off from the nations, nor the nations off from Israel. In the midst of a Europe rent by religious wars, a Europe of pogroms and of the Inquisition, Isaac was conscious of the fact that he dwelt in a country where mutual regard for beliefs was one of the basic laws of society. And Isaac paid a warm tribute of recognition and gratitude to his country: "God lets peace and tranquillity to dwell among them, so that even members of various denominations are not enemies of each other." Nor was he their enemy either. We know that he appreciated the moral value of Gentile learning. He was prepared to recognise elements of true religion even in what he conceived as a pagan belief, and moral values in what was to him but pagan forms of worship.

VI

To the Jews "Hizzuq 'Emunah" became what Isaac intended it to be: a weapon of defence. There is no critical edition of his work, but all the Jewish editions and versions—from the Spanish "Fortificación de la Fé" in 1621 to the "Befestigung des Glaubens" in 1865 reflect the hopes of the author.

To the Christians, the appearance of the Latin version of "Hizzuq 'Emunah" in 1681 proved quite a shock; the controversialists were taken by surprise. Believing that their missionary efforts among Jews would be successful if only they could meet the Jews on the common scriptural ground—outside the "brazen wall" of the Talmud, they suddenly saw their biblical Jew fighting on their own ground, with weapons of their own choice, and refusing to capitulate. A fierce campaign opened and was fought with every weapon of learning. The polemical literature dealing with "Hizzuq 'Emunah" would make quite a library, the imprints of which would run through three centuries.

In the camp of freethinkers, for quite different reasons, it was hailed as the highest achievement of criticism. The ideas of "Hizzuq 'Emunah" penetrated the thought of Voltaire and contributed to the work of English Deists. This chapter of the history of "Hizzuq 'Emunah" is closed. But the Christian controversy has continued even into the present century. Frankly speaking, this whole controversy, although fought with modernised weapons, brings very little that Isaac himself could not have found in the contemporary works of his opponents. Obsolete as they are from the point of view of modern learning, the walls of the "Fortress of Faith" seem hardly dented by the battering rams of theological controversy.

M. WAYSBLUM.

London.

MISCELLANEA HEBRAICA

1

In his *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics*¹ Professor Louis H. Gray makes the somewhat startling statement that haplology has no absolutely certain occurrences in Hebrew, though it is found elsewhere in Semitic. Numerous instances from the Scriptures could be adduced in refutation of this assertion, but it may suffice to quote only the following: מֵאֵן instead of מִמֵּאֵן in the phrase אֵתֶּם מֵאֵן אֶתְּךָ Ex. vii, 27, ix, 2, x, 4; Jer. xxxviii, 21, and the plural מֵאֵנִים ibid. xiii, 10—all clearly cases of participle Pi'el and not so-called verbal adjectives; מֵהָר instead of מִמֵּהָר in Isa. viii, 3 (parallel to the participle הֵחֵשׁ and Zeph. i, 14; and מֵפָּה for Memphis in Hos. ix, 6. Though, strictly speaking, all these are cases of haplography, they may be said to underlie the spoken word, hence may be termed also haplology. Comp. further Felix Perles² on the subject of haplography and Arthur A. Dembitz³ on the subject of haplophony in the Scriptures.

2

In Ugaritic, as is well known by this time, the prepositional prefix ב may signify not only "in, on" but also "from."⁴ That this characteristic obtains also in Biblical Hebrew may be seen from Ps. x, 1 לִמָּה יִהְיֶה תַעֲמֹד בְּרַחוּק, where בְּרַחוּק is equivalent to מִרַחוּק, as is evidenced by the common phrase עֲמֹד מִרַחוּק in the Bible.⁵ As a matter of fact all modern commentators emend the ב to מ, but this is really unnecessary if we keep in mind that both these prefixes may have the same meaning. Further evidence from the Bible may be seen in Josh. iii, 16, where בְּאֵד stands for מֵאֵד, and in 2 Ki. xiv, 13, where בְּשַׁעַר stands for מִשַּׁעַר. Perhaps also other cases of confusion between ב and מ belong to this category.⁶

3

There can be no doubt that the emphatic enclitic *-ma*, which is abundantly attested in Accadian, Ugaritic, and Southern Arabic,

¹ New York, 1934, §48.

² *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge*, pp. 23ff.

³ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, xxii (1931), 153.

⁴ See CYRUS H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*, Roma, 1947, pp. 81ff.

⁵ Comp. Ex. xx, 18 and 21; 1 Sam. xxvi, 13; 2 Ki. ii, 7; Isa. lix, 14; Ps. xxxviii, 12.

⁶ Comp. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament*, pp. 113f.

obtained also in biblical Hebrew. H. L. Ginsberg¹ pointed out that in Ps. xxix, 6 the difficult suffix of וִיִּקְרִים is nothing more than this emphatic *-ma* of no particular meaning. In support of this assertion I would like to adduce some more examples, which are by no means exhaustive. Isa. xxiii, 1 שָׂדֶר מְבִית מְבוֹא, which admittedly makes no sense, should probably be read שָׂדֶר מְבִית מְבוֹא and the final *mem* of the verb be construed as the emphatic enclitic *-ma*. Similarly in Hos. x, 9 לֹא תִשָּׁנּוּ בְּנֵי־עֵלֹוָה עַל מַלְחָמָה the final *mem* of the verb is probably not the pronominal suffix but rather the enclitic *-ma*, the sense being "war will not reach the men of iniquity at Gibeah." Again in Nah. i, 10 וְכַמְבָּאִם מְבוֹאִים the final *mem* of the infinitive makes no sense whatever and should consequently be construed as the emphatic *-ma*, the sense being "and as the drunken are getting drunk" (they shall be devoured, etc.). And again, Ps. xlii, 5 אֲדָרְסֶנּוּ עַד בֵּית אֱלֹהִים cannot be explained otherwise than אֲדָרְסֶנּוּ + emphatic *mem* or *-ma*, especially in view of אֲדָרְסֶנּוּ in Is. xxxviii, 15, the meaning being "I hop to the house of God."

4

The verb לָבַשׁ, commonly meaning "to clothe," must have signified originally "to draw near" or "to join closely," as may be seen from the Arabic phrase *labisa 'amra'atan* "he had the enjoyment of a woman,"² which literally denotes "he joined a woman closely." This use of the word is especially evident in Arabic poetry and elevated prose, as may be seen, for example, from the *Diwān* of 'Ubaid-Allah Ibn Qais Ar-Ruqayyat,³ where we read *wa'albashā wa'aslabhā* "and I drew near to her and I drew away from her." In keeping with this semantic nuance I might render Jud. vi, 34 וְרוּחַ יְהוָה לָבַשָּׁה אֶת גִּדְעוֹן "and the spirit of the Lord drew near to Gideon"; similarly Job xxix, 14 צָדִק לָבַשְׁתִּי וַיִּלְבַּשֵׁנִי might very appropriately be translated "I drew near to righteousness and it drew near to me"; and so on.

5

That the Hebrew stem לָקַח means not only "to take" but also "to seize forcibly, to overpower" may be seen from phrases like וְרוּחַ נִשְׁאָתָנִי וְתַקְחָנִי in Ez. iii, 14 "and a spirit lifted me up and overpowered me," or וַיִּקְחָנִי בְּצִיצַת רֹאשִׁי *ibid.* viii, 3 "and he seized me by a lock of my head," or וְאַל תַּקְחִי בְּעַפְעַפֶּיהָ in Prov. vi, 25 "and let her (namely the evil woman) not overpower thee with her eyelids," or אֵשׁ מִתְּלַקְדָּה in Ez. i, 4 "an overpowering fire," etc. In all these phrases לָקַח is almost synonymous with אָחַז,

¹ נחבי אגריה, p. 130.

² LANE, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 2647, col. 1.

³ Ed. N. RHODOKANAKIS, p. 220, 1, 16.

Arabic *'ahdh*, "to seize, to grasp," and the question is: How did this semantic development come about? Perhaps the concept "to take" developed gradually into the closely related concept "to take by force," without the additional word for "force," exactly as Arabic *lqh* "to take" came to mean also "to take root."¹ It may be relevant to state that in southern Arabic *لَقَّه* assumed the meaning *in vincula coniecit*.²

Recently G. R. Driver³ tried to derive some of these difficult *לָקַח* passages from a supposed Hebrew root *יקח*, Arabic *waqiha* "be bold, shameless," but while this connotation might suit Num. xvi, 1 and Job xv, 12, it does not suit very well Prov. vi, 25 discussed above.

6

That the etymon *שלח*, commonly meaning "to send," is used in the Scriptures also in the sense of "to strip, to undress," as in Syriac, Aramaic, and Arabic, is quite evident from a phrase like *נִזְוָה מְשֻׁלַּח וְנִעְזָב כַּמְדָּבָר* in Is. xxvii, 10, which can denote nothing else but "a habitation stripped and abandoned like the wilderness." However, this connotation no doubt underlies also some other obscure passages in the Bible, as, for instance, *רַגְלֵי שְׁלַחוּ* in Job xxx, 12, which I prefer to render "they strip my feet."⁴ Note the improvement in the sense of the entire verse: "Upon my right hand rise the brood; they strip my feet, and they cast up against me their crooked ways."⁵

7

The somewhat obscure and seemingly defective conditional clause in Gen. iv, 7 *לֹאֹא אִם תִּשָּׁב שָׂאת וְאִם לֹא תִשָּׁב לִפְתָּח חַטָּאת* *רבין* may be well illustrated from No. XVI of Homer's Epigrams⁶: *Ei men ti dōseis; ei de mē, ouch hestēxomen ou gar sunoikēsontes enthad' ēlthomen* "if you will give us anything—but if not we will not wait, for we are not come here to dwell with you." Evidently this sort of aposiopesis was not so unusual in the thought of man.

8

A striking illustration of *מִשְׁחוּי קֶשֶׁת* in Gen. xxi, 16, denoting the distance of a bowshot, is the analogous Arabic expression

¹ Comp. DOZY, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*, II, 543, col. 1.

² CONTI ROSSINI, *Chrestomathia Arabica Meridionalis Epigraphica*, Roma, 1931, p. 173, col. 2.

³ In the new German periodical, *Die Welt des Orients*, i, 235.

⁴ Comp. similar expressions in Arabic in Dozy's *Supplément*, i, 781.

⁵ Construing *אָד* in the sense of Arabic *'awd* meaning "curvature, crookedness," see LANE, *Lexicon*, p. 124, col. 3f.

⁶ See HESIOD, *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*, with an English translation by HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE, London, 1914 (The Loeb Classical Library), p. 476.

ghalwat sahm "bowshot," likewise used as a measure of distance.¹

9

With reference to עברה רבה in Gen. xxvi, 14 and Job i, 3 it is cogent to compare the Latin expression *dives operis* "abounding in servants."² The two distant expressions denote one and the same thing.

10

In commenting on פני הארץ in Gen. xli, 56 the Midrash Rabba on Genesis, section 91, has this to say: אין פני הארץ אלא עשירים That this interpretation is not altogether fanciful may be seen from the Arabic expression *wujūh* or *wujūh 'al-nāsi* meaning "chiefs."³ One might compare also the Yiddish expression די פני for important or outstanding people. Similarly we find the locution עיני העדה denoting "leaders of the community,"⁴ which likewise corresponds to Arabic *a'yān* meaning "famous people."⁵

11

In illustration of the Song of the Well in Num. xxi, 17 Gray⁶ cites a parallel from Nilus, and Gressmann⁷ quotes another from Musil. I wish to call attention to another, more striking, parallel in Musil's work⁸:

*Ebher yā ma'
erdī jemāma
biqaḏīben ḥāferīnu*

"Spring up, Oh water,
flow in abundance!
with a staff have we dug it
out."

12

In the colourful Balaam pericope of Num. ch. xxiii, there is evidence for both קבב and קבה as the stem denoting "to curse," yet the קבה form might be preferred to that of the media geminata for the simple reason that it has its counterpart in the Arabic stem

¹ Comp., for instance, *Selections from Arabic Geographical Literature*, ed. DE GOEJE, Leiden, 1907, p. 16 below.

² As found, for instance, in the *Amphitryon* of PLAUTUS, line 170 (Loeb Classical Library edition of Plautus, i, 18 below).

³ See *Annales* of TABARI, ed. DE GOEJE et al., First Series, I (Lugd. Bat., 1893), 2739 middle; also *Selections from Arabic Geographical Literature*, ed. DE GOEJE, p. 14, 1, 15.

⁴ In *Gaonic Responsa*, ed. HARKAVY, No. 37; comp. also MANN, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs*, ii, 218.

⁵ LANE, *Lexicon*, p. 2216, col. 2 middle.

⁶ In his *Commentary on the Book of Numbers*, p. 289.

⁷ In his book, *Moses*, p. 350.

⁸ *Arabia Petraea*, iii, 259.

qbh signifying "to render hideous or foul, to disapprove (especially of God towards men)," hence "to curse."¹ In this sense it occurs in the Koran xxviii, 42 *min almaqbūhīna* "of the accursed ones" and in the thirty-ninth Makama of Hāriri *waqabaḥa 'alluka* "and the churl cursed."

13

In support of Ehrlich² that שחם העין in Num. xxiv, 3 and 15 signifies "grim-eyed," as in Arabic, one might adduce the Arabic expression *shatim 'almuhayyā* "grim-faced," and the similar expression *shatim 'alwajh* in Farazdak's Poem in praise of al-Walīd ibn Yazīd.³ It is not necessary to assume with Ehrlich the reading *setum*, on the basis that an Arabic *sh* becomes *s* in Hebrew, for there are plenty of words with the same sibilant in both languages.⁴

14

As an illustration of פֶּרוֹר = פֶּאֶרְרוֹר "a pot," hence "blackness," in Jo. ii, 6 and Na. ii, 11⁵ may serve the following stich from J. C. Ewald Falls' interesting book of Bedouin songs from the Libyan desert⁶:

"Those who pay homage to the old
Had faces like flames
But the cowards were discolored
Like a new pot on the fire"

15

In the Contest of Homer and Hesiod⁷ the former answers the latter's query *ti fertaton esti brotoisin*⁸ as follows: *Archēn men mē funai epichthonioisin ariston, funta d'hopōs ōkista pulas Aidao perēsai*.⁹ This sentiment is so similar to Jer. xx, 14 ff. and Job iii, 3 ff that one might conclude that one depends on the other or that the two go back to a common source. As a matter of fact there was no literary point of contact between Hebrew and Greek at that early period, and the only conclusion possible is that both the Hebrew and the Greek are based on common human experience, which is

¹ See especially Dozy, *Supplément*, ii, 298.

² *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, ad loc.

³ Ed. JOSEPH HELL, Leipzig, 1902, p. 14.

⁴ Comp. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*, i, 128ff.

⁵ The verse reads וְכָל פְּנֵים קִבְּצוּ פֶּאֶרְרוֹר "all faces have gathered blackness."

⁶ *Beduinen-Lieder der libyschen Wüste*, Cairo, 1908, pp. 181f.

⁷ The Loeb Classical Library edition of *Hesiod and Homerica*, p. 572, i, 314f.

⁸ "What is best for mortal men?"

⁹ "For men on earth it is best never to be born at all; or being born, to pass through the gates of Hades with all speed."

alike throughout the habitable globe and is expressed alike in all languages of the world—the notion that the life of man is at best tragic and far from worthwhile.

16

The relation of Paul's saying *pou sou, thanate, to nikos*; *pou sou thanate, to kentron* ("O death, where is thy victory, O death where is thy sting?") in 1 Cor. xv, 55 to **איה נברך מות איה קטבך שאל** in Hos. xiii, 14b has been discussed numerous times by numerous exegetes, but without any degree of definitiveness or finality. A fresh attempt at a solution was made recently by H. S. Nyberg,¹ who put forth the suggestion that the New Testament text might have been based on some such version as this: **איה נברך מות איה דרבך (דרבנך?) שאל**. Of course, *nikos* does not correspond to **נבר**,² but it is true that *kentron* is the equivalent of **ררב** or **דרבך**, as pointed out long ago by C. F. Houbigant.³ The trouble with Nyberg is that in his anxiety to square the Hebrew with the Greek he assumes that in the Hebrew text of Paul **נברך** stood instead of **דרבך** and **דרבך** or **דרבנך** instead of **קטבך**—an assumption which is far-fetched and hardly likely. We may confidently assume **רב** or **דרבנך** instead of **דרבך** through the common error of metathesis, but under no circumstances can we assume this reading instead of **קטבך** on a sound philological basis. And so the question remains: Can 1 Cor. xv, 55 be squared with Hos. xiii, 14b? I hardly think so. Most likely the former is a conscious or purposeful variant of the latter, though strictly based on it. Such themes and variations are quite frequent in the Old Testament itself, particularly in the Book of Proverbs.⁴

However, the Hebrew text is hardly *comme il faut*. The word **דרבך** is impossible in this connection, whether we take it in the sense of "thy words" or the more customary "thy plagues,"⁵ hence we should properly read **דרבך**, as hinted by Houbigant and Nyberg. True, **ררב** does not occur in our Bible, but **דרבך** does, rendered *boukentron* in the Septuagint, and there is no reason whatever why **ררב** should not have existed to correspond to the Septuagint's *kentron* or Aquila's *dēgma* (נוכחתא). As to **איה**, which is impossible as a verb, rather than construing it as an exclamation **איה** "Oh" with the *JPS* version, I favour reading **איה** "where" with the Septuagint and Ibn Janah and Ibn Ezra. The interrogative **איה** being a demonstrative made up of three exclamatory letters, the position of these letters might have been varied sometimes,

¹ In his *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (Uppsala, 1935), p. 104f.

² **נברך** should be the right word.

³ In his *Notae Criticae in V. T. Libros* (Frankfurt-a.-M., 1777), ii, 560.

⁴ Comp. TORCZYNER's recent commentary on Proverbs, משה שלמה, Tel Aviv, 1947.

⁵ Note that **ררב** "plague" is used in the Bible only in the singular, never in the plural.

yielding **אחי** instead of **איה**. Therefore, the original text of Hosea must have been as follows: **איה דרבך מות, איה קשבך שאול**, "Where is thy sting, O death? Where is thy destruction, O grave?" That the ancient versions were confused about this verse may be seen from the fact that they applied the term "sting" to **קשב** instead of to **דרבך**.

17

The proverb **לא יחכם שונא תורה ומתמוטט כמסערה אנו** of the rediscovered Ben Sira or Ecclesiasticus xxxiii, 2¹ was rightly considered wrong, because altogether void of sense. Both the Septuagint's *anēr sofos ou misēsei nomon ho de hypokrinomenos en autō hōs en kataigidi ploion* and Vulgate's *Sapiens non odit mandata et iustitias et non illidetur quasi in procella navis*, though departing somewhat from the Hebrew original, pointed in the right direction; and on the basis of these versions the late Max L. Margolis² suggested the reading **אנוני** = *onī*, "vessel" instead of the incomprehensible **אנו**. This sensible reading has been adopted by Prof. M. Z. Segal in his recent edition of Ben Sira,³ though incongruously in the fuller form **אניה**. The word **כמסערה** goes back to **במסערה**, since **ב** and **מ** interchange very frequently in the Scriptures.⁴ The correct reading then is **לא יחכם שונא תורה ומתמוטט כמסערה אני**, which should be rendered as follows: "He who hates the Torah is not wise, tottering like a ship in a storm." Of course, one is tempted to follow the Septuagint in the second line and render "and a hypocrite is like a ship in a storm," which gives the verse a better balance, only **מתמוטט** is not found in this sense anywhere in Hebrew literature. As to the reversed order of the Septuagint in the first phrase, as if it were **חכם לא ישנא תורה**, it is undoubtedly due to theological scruples on the part of the translators, who somehow did not want to associate hatred with the Torah and hence rendered "a wise man does not hate the Torah."

18

One of the most difficult verses in the entire book of the Hebrew Ben Sira is undoubtedly xxxiii, 4, which in the edition of Joseph Marcus⁵ reads as follows: **הכן דברידך ואחר תעשה ובית מנוח ואחר: תניה הכן בחוץ בשדה לך אחר ובנית ביתך** of Prov. xxiv, 27, is wanting in the Syriac version, while in the Greek version it appears in a quite discrepant form: *hetoimason logon kai houtōs akousthēsē*

¹ Ed. JOSEPH MARCUS, Philadelphia, 1931, p. 14.

² In a note to MARCUS's edition cited above.

³ Jerusalem, 1933, *ad loc.*

⁴ Comp. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament*, pp. 113f.

⁵ Philadelphia, 1931, pp. 14f.

sundēson paideian kai tote apokrithēti, which leads to something like the following: הכן דברך ואחר תשמע צור תעודה (or מוסר) ואחר תנוד. Anyway, it is of very little value for the reconstruction of the original Hebrew. After a lengthy discussion of the Hebrew text Marcus arrives at the following insipid translation: "Prepare thy words and then shalt thou do, build a resting-place and then shalt thou go forth?" A still later editor of the Hebrew text, Prof. M. Z. Segal of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, formulates the verse as follows¹: הכן דברך ואחר תעשה ובית מנוח ואחר תנוה. Undoubtedly this is an improvement over Marcus, but it still leaves much to be desired. For one thing, the prosaic and discordant תעשה cannot be original and probably hides something more akin to דברך.

After considerable thought I have arrived at the conclusion that the original text must have read: הכן דברך ואחר תשתע ובית מנוח. "Prepare thy words and then converse, and a house for rest and then repose." The Hithp. of שעה occurs already in the Bible in the sense of "gaze at each other,"² but in Targum and Talmud it actually assumes the meaning, "to converse, to talk,"³ As a matter of fact it is used in this particular sense once more in our book, namely xliv, 8. Moreover, the appropriateness of this word becomes apparent in the light of the Greek text: תשמע can easily be explained as an aberration from the very rare תשתע. As to תנוה, it is a denominative verb, derived from נוה "abode, dwelling," and occurs only once in the Bible, namely in Hab. ii, 5, but it suits very well here and its corruption to the present incomprehensible תניה can easily be explained through the square script.⁴

19

The *nomen loci* בשן, which is explained etymologically by the Arabic *bathna*, pl. *bithan*, "even and smooth ground," though in Arabic the same district is called Haurān, is very peculiarly rendered by the Targum מהנן and once כותנן.⁵ Both seem to be corrupted readings, and in view of בתניא of the Targum Yerushalmi they should both be reduced to בתנן. The corruption can easily be explained: כו is an easy aberration from מ in the square script, and מ frequently interchanges with ב in Semitic.⁶ Further, it is well known that Hebrew ש = Aramaic ת = Arabic *th*.⁷

1 Jerusalem, 1933, p. 52.

2 BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Lexicon*, p. 1043.

3 See JASTROW, *Dictionary*, p. 1610.

4 Comp. on such errors the often quoted works of FELIX PERLES and FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH cited above.

5 Comp. Ps. lxvii, 23.

6 See WILLIAM WRIGHT, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of Semitic Languages*, p. 65.

7 See *ibid.*, p. 60.

Few people realise that the common phrase **וידבר על העצים**, which occurs in late medieval and modern Hebrew literature and designates someone speaking on all kinds of irrelevant topics, is neither biblical nor Mishnic in origin. All we find in the Bible is **וידבר על העצים** said in I Ki. v, 13 of the wise King Solomon, who propounded many parables of trees, "from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall," though **עץ** and **אבן** are found to be associated in other connections, as, e.g., Jer. ii, 27. And yet the phrase may be proved to be ancient, perhaps even more ancient than the Bible itself. After being puzzled over its source or origin for a long time I chanced upon it one day in Hesiod's *Theogony*, line 35¹: *alla ti ē moi tauta peri drun ē peri petrēn*, "but why all this about oak or stone?" Evidently it serves here, too, as a proverbial saying meaning "why enlarge on irrelevant topics?" But later, when the ancient Canaanite texts of the fifteenth century B.C.E. were discovered at Ras Shamra or ancient Ugarit in northern Syria, I found the identical phrase in them, too, though with a differently implied meaning. Comp. the striking locution *tgrgr labnm wl'sm*,² which is rendered "thou speakest to stones and trees." For another example of this locution comp. *Wathnyk rgm 'š wl'sht abn*,³ which means "and I shall tell thee the speech of the tree and the whisper of the stone." Evidently it was an ancient Semitic phrase, which might have been borrowed by the Greeks together with so many other expressions, but is not found in the Bible, though it reappears in medieval and modern Hebrew.

JOSEPH REIDER.

Dropsie College.

¹ Loeb Classical Library edition, p. 80.

² In GORDON'S *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 145, col. 1 (Text 52, 1, 66); see also H. L. GINSBERG, *כתבי אוגרית*, p. 84, 1, 66.

³ GORDON'S *Handbook* p. 188, col. 1 ('*Anat*, iii, 1, 19).

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

RESTORATION OF THE "DAMASCUS FRAGMENTS": XIV, 12-16

The editors of the *Damascus Fragments* have restored effaced words in section xiv, 12-16, from the traces of letters that are still visible in the manuscript and, in one instance, by pure conjecture, without, however, stating explicitly that this is what they have done (Schechter, p. 14; Rost, pp. 25-26; Habermann, p. 120). Traces of letters are very deceptive and restorations other than those made by the editors are still possible. Before offering what appears to me a more satisfactory restoration of the section, I shall first reproduce it, printing only letters and words, the reading of which is, in my opinion, certain:

וזה סרך הרבים להכין כל חפציהם שכר ו . . . נ . י . לכל חדש
למ . . . ונתנו על יד המבקר והשופטים ו ממנו יתנו בעד . . . בים
וממנו יחזיקו ביד עני ואביון ולזקן אשר ו . . . ת . ולאיש אשר ינע
ולא . ר ישבה לגוי נכר ולבתולה אשר ו . . . נ . ל . ר . ר . אין
לו דורש.

The gist of the passage is sufficiently clear. It deals with the distribution of charity among various categories of people. How to restore the complete text? The best chance of achieving a good restoration is in turning to kindred literature; and since the *Fragments* and the *Dead Sea Scrolls* are, in my opinion, Christian, I shall quote here three extracts from Christian literature:

1. "On Sunday . . . they who are well to do and willing give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the stranger sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need" (Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* I, lxvii, 6-8; E.T. in *Ante Nicene Christian Library*, II, Edinburgh, 1867, p. 65).

2. "We are governed by the most approved elders . . . Even if we have a kind of treasury, this is not filled up from a sense of obligation, as of hired religion. Each member adds a small sum once a month, or when he pleases, and only if he is willing and able . . . These are the deposits as it were made by devotion. For that sum is disbursed . . . on the supporting and burying of the poor, and on boys and girls deprived of property and parents, and on aged servants of the house, also on shipwrecked persons, and any, who are in the mines or on islands or in prisons . . ." (Tertullian, *Apologetic.* xxxix, 5-6. E.T., by A. Souter, Cambridge, 1917, p. 113).

3. "If you can afford it give the ransom of your sins" (*Didachē*, iv, 6: *ean echēs dia tōn cheirōn sou dōseis lutrōsin hamartiōn sou*).¹

The cumulative significance of these Christian extracts suggests forcibly the following restoration of the passage:

וזה סרך הרבים להכין כל חפציהם שכר ו [עו]נ[ו]ן [יביא] לכל
חדש למנ[חזו] ונתנו על יד המבקר והשופטים ממנו יתנו בעד
[הר]בים וממנו יחזיקו ביד עני ואביון ולזקן אשר ו [בבית] ולאיש אשר
ינע ולאשר ישבה לנוי נכר ולבתולה אשר ו [אי]ן לה נ[ואל] ² [ולנע]ר
[אש]ר ² אין לו דורש.

"This is the ordinance for the community³ to provide for all their needs. [Everyone] shall bring his offering once a month as the [ransom] price⁴ of his sin and give it to the 'Overseer.' The 'judges' [deacons] shall disburse from it for the needs of the community, and support from it the poor and needy, the aged [servants] in the house, those who are struck by illness,⁵ captives among an alien race, girls who have nobody to protect them and boys who have nobody to care for them."

The Christian extracts refer to the same kind of organised charity and "function" of offerings as does the section of the *Fragments*. They supply additional evidence of the Christian origin of the *Fragments* and of the related *Dead Sea Scrolls*, as well as decisive proof against the "Essene hypothesis." The Essenes, according to Philo and Josephus Flavius, practised Communism, but alms-giving and organised charity have no place in a Communist economy.

Let it be thought that the *Dead Sea Scrolls* differ in this respect from the *Fragments*, let me quote the law contained in the *Discipline Scroll*, vii, 6-8:

ואם בהון היחד יתרמה לאבדו ישלמו ו ברושו ו ואם לא תשני ידו
לשלמו ונענש ששים יום.

"If anyone wilfully⁶ destroys communal property he shall restore it from his own; and if he has no sufficient means of restoring it, he shall be punished with sixty days [of prison]."

This law clearly distinguishes "communal" from "private" property, and, obviously, recognises the existence of private property. There is no trace whatever of Communism either in the *Fragments* or in the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, as will be shown in the forthcoming continuation of my studies on this subject.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

¹ The idea that offerings are the ransom of sins is also contained in *Apost. Constitutions*, vii, 12.

² This restoration is by other scholars.

³ רבים as in רשות הרבים ("public").

⁴ שכר. Cpr. Jon. I, 3.

⁵ ינע, *nif'al* for ינע (HABERMANN).

⁶ Or, maliciously, תרמה, a verb coined under the influence of the phrase ביד רמה

CURRENT LITERATURE

LEO PRIJS. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*. E. J. Brill, Leiden. 1948. Pp. xxv + 118.

The circumstance that the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, like the Latin translation after it, came to be regarded as the inspired text of the Christian Church has too often diverted attention from the fact that—since the Greek versions were in the first place made by Jews and for Jewish use—septuagintal studies are incomplete unless constant regard is paid to other Jewish exegesis and translations. Z. Frankel laid the foundations of this approach a hundred years ago in his *Vorstudien zu der LXX* and his *Einfluss*—which examined the influence of Palestinian *midrash* on Alexandrian scriptural hermeneutics. Dr. Leo Priejs' monograph is in direct line of descent from those almost patriarchal works, and he has drawn extensively on rabbinic sources; in addition to exploiting Sa'adyah and the medieval commentators (the latter are so often valuable testimony to midrashic material now lost) he has also made use of material from the realm of *piyyut*. This is a signal service, because the literature of the *payyetanim* is somewhat intractable and is in any case virtually unknown to biblical scholars. It is a pity that the corresponding minefield on the Greek side, the *koine* vocabulary of the papyri, has apparently been overlooked by the author; Preisigke's *Wörterbuch* does not appear in his bibliography.

Priejs divides his investigation into six chapters which deal respectively

with (1) *halakhah*, (2) *'aggadah*, (3) substituted readings involving different vocalisation, consonantal changes, and the subdivision of words, (4) theological influences stimulated by the dominating position of *torah* in Jewish thought or by eschatological ideas, (5) insertions and supplementary additions, and (6) *enjambement*, or different verse division. To this are added a number of passages where the Hebrew syntax is equivocal, but the rendering of the LXX coincides with that demanded by the massoretic accentuation. In general, the priority, if not indeed the originality, of the massoretic text is taken for granted, and it is assumed without a general discussion of the subject that the massoretic vocalisation was known to the translators of the Septuagint. Priejs claims (p. xxi) to have established the principle that "in contrast to the usual procedure of OT textual criticism, every variant of the LXX from the MT must be examined as to whether or not it can be explained on the basis of Jewish tradition." It seems that, so long as this can be done by even the most tenuous of connections, Priejs is not prepared to assume that the Greek translators had before them a different Hebrew text. If it is not pressed to unreasonable lengths, this line of argument is not unsound. Rabbi Ishmael's thirteen rules of halakhic exegesis, and the thirty-two of Rabbi Eliezer for *'aggadah*, are reflected in the Aramaic Targums; and there is no *a priori* reason why we should not find something of the sort in the LXX, especially

in view of interesting suggestions recently made by D. Daube and S. Lieberman that some of these *middoth* can themselves be traced back to the forensic argumentation of the hellenistic orators.

But these rules developed gradually—we know that Ishmael's thirteen represent an extension of Hillel's seven, and the LXX began approximately two hundred years before Hillel. So that account must be taken not only of the chronology of hermeneutic development of *halakhah* in general, as well as of the translations of the various books (the latter point is touched on incidentally in one passage), but also of the oblitative tendency towards such specifically Jewish interpretation to be expected once the transmission of the Greek text had become a Christian affair. Nevertheless, if the material is stratified as far as possible, and the principle applied circumspectly, the approach can be fruitful. But to press it unduly becomes a *tour de force*, and to this, unfortunately, the author is all too prone. His principle certainly seems to be vindicated by such cases as Proverbs vi, 6, where the Greek *sophoteros* seems clearly to reflect a deduction *a fortiori* actually found in connection with that text in Deut. Rabba v, 2. But against this we must set such cases as Ex. xxii, 12, in connection with which Prijs argues (p. 6) that the septuagintal rendering does not presuppose a reading 'ad instead of 'ed, since the *Mekhilta*, which reads 'ed, adduces several explanations, including that of Rabbi Jonathan, which involves treating it as 'ad. But how do we know that the *Mekhilta*, or Rabbi Jonathan, or even Sa'adyah (whose evidence is utilised elsewhere) must have read the massoretic vowels and punctuation? If rabbinic exegesis were unanimously agreed

the massoretic vocalisation and with the LXX, it might be a different matter. On p. 47ff the author assembles a large number of instances where 'ad is rendered 'ed and vice versa, a few of which correspond to rabbinic 'al *tigre*' substitutions; but the assertion that in each case the massoretic vowel points were considered by the LXX, who, nevertheless, rejected the *peshat*, or plain meaning, in favour of the *derash*, or application, is unconvincing. Equally so is the contention that in Gen. xv, 11 (*wayyasshebh 'otham 'Abhram=kai sunekathisen autois Abrām*) the Greek represents not a different vocalisation but the same aggadic interpretations as is adduced in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, viz., that Abram acquired merit by defending the carcasses which represented his own descendants after their death. The Greek is alleged to mean here that Abram *sat with them [in order to protect them]*. But *sunkathizein* does not bear this special connotation, so that if Prijs is right, the LXX have signally failed to convey both the plain and their own applied meaning of the text.

According to the author (p. 61) the fact that the LXX, who certainly had at heart the object of preserving the original text, were prepared to resort without hesitation to translations on the basis of substituted ('al *tigre*') vocalisations, indicates that the original text was so deeply rooted that the LXX risked no confusion in preferring the *dërash*. The argument is indeed circular. And were the original LXX, or any of the subsequent translators, so concerned with accurate rendering? Even the Talmud preserves an echo (*T.B. Megillah* 9a-b) of circum-spect alterations in the literal translation made "because of king

Ptolemy." Interesting, however, is Prijs' suggestion (p. 63, n. 3) that sometimes variant Greek readings represent the *peshat* and *derash* respectively.

This book would have carried much greater conviction if a large number of dubious cases had been omitted, or classified as such. The reader is under the necessity of having to do this for himself; but the fact that much is hazardous should not be allowed to cast into oblivion the solid core of useful results that remains.

RAPHAEL LOEWE.

Leeds.

G. ÖSTBORN: *Cult and Canon: A Study in the Canonisation of the Old Testament.* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.) 1950. Pp. 129. Kr. 6.

In this monograph the author's purpose is to discover the principal motive which led to the selection of books which became the Canon of the Old Testament. What he calls secondary motives—such as relate to language, style, authorship, time and place of composition, and so on—fall outside the scope of his study. He pursues his inquiry along two main lines, *viz.*, a cultic interpretation of the contents of the books of the Old Testament, and the cultic pattern in the ancient Near East as modern research has reconstructed it.

A short introduction is followed by five main chapters: ch. i (pp. 12-15) deals with the Greek word *kanon* as a designation of a collection of writings; ch. ii (pp. 15-20) treats of the Canon as Law and as the Inspired Word; in ch. iii (pp. 20-74) the fundamental motif of the contents of the Canon is discussed—the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings are each considered in turn; ch. iv (pp. 75-96) has for its subject the Canon as

a representation concerning Yhwh's activity; and ch. v (pp. 96-108) is devoted to a consideration of the Canon as a cultic representation. A useful bibliography is provided, and there is an index of authorities cited and also of biblical passages.

The author's main thesis is briefly as follows. Canonicity implies a common and essential quality belonging to all the books of the Old Testament, and an examination of the word *kanon*, which expresses something which is "correct" from a certain point of view, leads to the conclusion that *kanon* was applied to the Old Testament because of its religious quality and function. An examination of the contents of the Old Testament shows that its principal motif is the idea of Yhwh's activity, whether acting himself or through prominent human personalities, and that, underlying it, is the thought of a struggle against a state of distress or chaos, and of victory over it, a stabilised order following upon victory. Yhwh's activity is thus presented in the Old Testament as a divine drama, with struggle and victory as its principal elements, and in this is to be seen the actual origin of the Old Testament's special quality and function as a religious Canon—"That a certain writing has, through its contents, clearly illustrated this activity, or some element of it, apparently was the fundamental motive for this writing being raised to canonical dignity" (p. 108). Further, this fundamental motif of Yhwh's activity is to be regarded as cultic, the idea of struggle and victory corresponding with the theme lying at the basis of the temple cult, even of the service of the synagogue. The books of the Old Testament Canon were selected for a special purpose, *viz.*, for recitation in the cult, and the chief motive for their selection was the

feeling which the selectors had, consciously or unconsciously, that they were religiously "correct," that their contents made them suitable for recitation in the cult, in which Yhwh's activity, with its underlying theme of struggle and victory, was celebrated. While the author finds the origin of the Old Testament Canon in Exodus i-xv, he holds that, strictly speaking, it goes back to a Canaanite prototype. He makes a special point that the periods in which the three main sections of the Hebrew Bible were definitely closed were periods of stabilisation, both political and spiritual. The canonisation of the Law is put at about 450 B.C.; the prophetic canon was closed perhaps at the time of Simon, the son of Onias, about 200 B.C.; while the Writings became canonical before the beginning of the Christian era. The entire Canon was closed at some date in the last century B.C., perhaps during the reign of Herod the Great.

The preoccupation of Scandinavian Old Testament scholars with the cult is, as is well known, one of the outstanding features of Old Testament study to-day, and this monograph is further evidence of it. For a full evaluation of the correctness or otherwise of the author's thesis, it would be necessary to consider his work against the whole background of the ancient Near Eastern cultic pattern in general and the form it may have assumed in Israel in particular. For the purpose of this review it must suffice to indicate briefly that there are some aspects of his work which raise certain doubts. His attempt to discover a fundamental idea run-

ning throughout the whole of the Old Testament writings—and this is central to his thesis—is, as the author himself is aware (p. 20), beset with many difficulties, and it cannot but be felt that his discovery of the struggle-victory motif is sometimes forced—for example, when he finds it in the book of Proverbs in the struggle between folly and wisdom for the mastery over man (p. 66), or again, when he sees in *Kohleth* a portrayal of the way in which God saves through Wisdom (p. 69). A theory so all-embracing as is the author's must inevitably find itself from time to time subjected to such pressures. On some smaller points too the author's views do not easily persuade. For example, is it anything more than fanciful to suppose that the prophetic books were definitely limited to fifteen so that they might correspond in number with the three patriarchs and the twelve tribes (p. 45)? Again, the author considers that *הַצֶּפֶן* (Joel ii, 20) is probably a cultic mythological expression for "the foe" (p. 58, n. 2), but he supplies no evidence in support of his view. In general it may be said of this work, as of much similar Scandinavian work on the Old Testament, that it gives the impression that a great deal has been built up on slender evidence. The author has, however, raised many points of interest, and his monograph—which is not very easy to read on account of its English style—may be read with profit even by those whose standpoint is different from his.

D. WINTON THOMAS.
Cambridge.